Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. 1

10420

SC8

William Wilkins
tallo Chandler in nayes wor

Truth Vindicated,

IN

Several Branches thereof;

AND

Many OBJECTIONS fairly and ſoberly Anſwered.

To which is annexed

A little Treatiſe of the COVENANTS, containing a Deſcription of the Covenant of Grace, and ſeveral Marks of diſtinction, by which it appears, That the Covenant that was made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, conſidered as ſuch, was not the Covenant of Works, nor yet the Covenant of Grace, but a peculiar Covenant.

What thing ſoever I command you, that obſerve and do; thou ſhalt not add thereto, nor diminiſh from it, Deut. 12. 32.

Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt, Matth. 28. 19.

Teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World, Amen. *v.* 20.

LONDON,

Printed for the Author. 1695.

TO THE

READER.

Courteous Reader,

THou haſt here the ſubſtance of what hath paſt in Writing between a Baptiſt and a Pedo-baptiſt, about the point of Baptiſm, that hath been long Controverted among us. The reaſon why the Pedo-baptiſt goes Nameleſs, is becauſe the Author hath a Reſpect for him: Firſt, Upon the account of his Abilities. Secondly, Upon the Account of his Moderation in Writing, not dipping his Pen ſo much in Vinegar as others have done. And, Thirdly, Upon the Account of his Converſation. To which is annexed a little Treatiſe of the Covenants. Now tho' there are ſeveral things contained in the Covenants that are handled in the firſt part of the book, yet it's thought neceſſary to print them by

themselves, where thou mayest see the scope of them more fully and clearly. All that the Author desires of thee, is, that thou wouldest read with an unprejudic'd Eye, and weigh it in the ballance of the Sanctuary: Try it by the Word, which is the great standard, a Touch-stone of Truth, and so far as it hath foundation in the Word, receive it, and no further. Farewell.

Advertisement.

BY reason of the Author's great distance from the Press, several Remarkable Errors have been let slip, which the Reader is desired to take Notice of, and to amend, which are as follows.

P. 2. of the Epistle l. 7. for *a* r. *and*. p. 61. l. 18. blot out *not*. p. 126. l. 33. r. *not* after the word *doth*. p. 154. l. 24. add, *In order to the enjoyment of some New-Covenant Blessings*, p. 168. after the 11*th*. line add, *Ninthly, Seeing they rejected all the means of their Conversion, it is evident that they were not the Children of the Promise*. p. 269. l. 30. for *Heb*. 5. r. *Heb*. 8. p. 283. l. 13. for *Redeemed* r. *Redeemer*. p. 279. l. 29. add, *this word* for *is a word causial*. p. 280. l. 2. for *Posterity* r. *Prosperity*. p. 292. l. 41. for *Covenant* r. *Covenants*. What other Errors there are, may be corrected by the sense.

Truth Vindicated,

IN

Several Branches thereof, &c.

SIR,

I Have received your Paper, entitled, *Infant-Baptiſm Vindicated*, and have returned my Anſwer.

Your firſt Argument is this, *Thoſe that are to be entred into Covenant with God, and to be admitted Members of the viſible Church, have a right to Baptiſm, and ought to be baptized, there being no other way of divine inſtitution (under the Goſpel) of admiſſion of members, but by baptiſm.*

But the Infants of believing Parents ought to be admitted into covenant with God, members of the viſible Church, therefore they have a right to baptiſm.

Firſt, I anſwer, As to the conſequence of your *Major* Propoſition, which is this, That thoſe that are ſolemnly to be admitted into the viſible Church, (if by the viſible Church you mean an inſtituted Church) have a right to baptiſm, I grant it, though I deny that Baptiſm is the formal conſtituting cauſe of Church-Membership: For that which may be but once adminiſtred, is not the formal, conſtituting cauſe; but Baptiſm may be

but once administred, therefore it is not the formal constituting cause. For Example, A Person may be justly ejected, and upon repentance received again: But if baptism were the formal constituting cause, then must he be as often baptized as received.

Secondly, I deny your *Minor*, which is, That Children of Believing Parents ought to be entred into covenant with God, and admitted Members of the visible Church.

(1.) You say, the Covenant that God made with *Abraham*, belonged to his Seed; and while his seed were in an infant-state, they were in covenant, and engaged to God by circumcision, which was then the seal of the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7, 8, 11, 12.

To this I answer, *First*, This proves not that the Children of Believers ought solemnly to be taken into covenant with God, and admitted Church-Members, the Dispensation being changed, you your self do not tye to the rules of that dispensation: Under the legal dispensation a Bastard was not to enter into the Congregation of the Lord unto the tenth Generation, *Deut.* 23. 2. but you will admit a Bastard to enter in.

Secondly, I deny that all the seed of *Abraham* were circumcised; they were the Males only that were circumcised, and yet the Females were his Seed also.

Thirdly, I deny that covenant to which circumcision was set as the token, *Gen.* 17. 11, 12. to be the covenant of Grace: That covenant that might be broken was not the coveuant of Grace; but the Covenant to which Circumcision was set as the token, was a Covenant that might be broken, *Gen.* 17. 14. therefore not the covenant of grace.

(2.) You

(2.) You say, that under the Government of *Moses*, Parents and Children entred into covenant with the Lord, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12.

First, *Answer*, This I grant you; but I deny that covenant to be the covenant of Grace, for the Scripture makes a manifest difference between these two covenants.

First, They differ in respect of the Subjects; the subjects of that covenant, *Deut.* 29. were the natural seed, considered as such, but these were not the subjects of the covenant of Grace, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Not as though the word of God hath taken none effect, for they are not all Israel that are of Israel; neither because they are the seed of Abraham, are they all children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called: So then they that are the children of the flesh, these are not the children of God, but the children of the promise are accounted for the seed:* The Apostle distinguisheth here between the children of the flesh and the children of the promise; and the same might be noted of *Jacob* and *Esau*, the one being hated, and the other loved: Must *Esau* be owned a subject of the covenant of Grace, who was an object of the Fathers hatred? There are no more to be accounted the subjects of the covenant of Grace, either of *Jews* or *Gentiles*, then are related to Christ, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams seed, and heirs according to the promise.*

Secondly, That Covenant contained curses, (as well as blessings) *Deut.* 29. 20, 21. which might fall on the subjects thereof without a sanctified use of them, as they did on the evil figs, *Jer.* 24. 8, 9, 10. but the covenant of Grace contains blessings only, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. That these were two covenants, appears,

First, Because that covenant was broken, *verse* 32.

32. but the covenant of Grace can't be broken, *Jer.* 32. 40.

Secondly, That Covenant contained only temporal blessings, *Deut.* 28. God did never promise a New Heart and a New Spirit by vertue of that covenant; if he had, all the natural seed should have had the enjoyment of it, for he is a faithful God, a covenant-keeping God; but the covenant of Grace contains spiritual blessings, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *I will write my law in their hearts, they shall all know me: I will forgive their iniquities, and remember their sins no more.*

Thirdly, That Covenant was conditional, as appears in that it was broken, *Jer.* 31. 32. but the covenant of Grace is absolute, *verse* 33, 34. That covenant was an old covenant, *Heb.* 8. *last.* the covenant of grace a new, *Heb.* 9. 15. That covenant was the first, the covenant of Grace the second, *Heb.* 9. 18. The covenant of Grace was a better covenant, *Heb.* 8. 6. the promises were better.

First, In that they contained spiritual blessings.

Secondly, In that they were absolute; that covenant is abrogated, *Zach.* 11. 10, 11. but the covenant of Grace still remains: That covenant being thus distinguished from the covenant of grace, no Argument can be drawn for the Church-membership and baptism of the children of Believers under the Gospel from that covenant dispensation.

In the next place you endeavour to prove that covenant to be the covenant of Grace, to which I need make no reply, it being answered already; only I shall examine your Scriptures, *Rom.* 4. 13. *Gal.* 3. 14, 16, 17. That the covenant here spoken of is the covenant of Grace, I grant; but these prove not the covenant, *Deut.* 29. to be the covenant of Grace, and that's the Work you have to do.

Secondly,

Secondly, These Scriptures do not prove the natural seed to be the subjects of the covenant of Grace, but the contrary; he saith not of seeds, as of many, but of one, that is Christ, Christ Mystical, Head and Members, Christ and the Elect, *verse* 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.*

First, Prove your relation to Christ, and then you may conclude your relation to *Abraham*; to *Abraham* and to his seed were the Promises made, not to every believer and his seed: *Abraham* had but two seeds, a natural and a spiritual; the *Gentiles* are not his natural seed, nor can they be known to be spiritual, till they walk in the steps of *Abraham*'s faith.

Secondly, As I have denied that covenant that was signed by circumcision to be the covenant of Grace, so I deny that the natural seed of *Abraham* did enter into that covenant by circumcision, their interest in that covenant was antecedent to their circumcision.

First, The covenant was made with *Abraham* fourteen years before circumcision was appointed, *Gen.* 15. 18. compared with *Gen.* 17.

Secondly, They were born interested in the covenant, but not circumcised till the eighth day; if they had not had an interest in the covenant, then neglect of circumcision could not have been a breach of the covenant, as it was, *Gen.* 17. 14.

Thirdly, The Females were not circumcised at all, and yet they had an interest in the covenant as well as the Males.

Fourthly, I deny that interest which the natural seed had in that covenant, and that Church-membership which then they enjoyed, to be sufficient to priviledge them to Baptism. Those that came to *John* to be baptized, *Mat.* 3. and *Luke* 3. and were

were rejected, had an interest in that covenant, they were Church-Members, they had *Abraham* to their Father, but this would not do, they must bring forth fruit meet for repentance; yet had they as strong an argument as any you have brought for the baptizing of infants.

They were all interested in the covenant, all Church-members, to whom Christ and *John* preached; but first discipled, and then baptized, *John* 4. 1.

Your last Argument is this, *That if admitting infants into covenant with God, and so into the visible Church, be repealed, it belongs to us to shew when and how.*

I answer, before you challenge me to shew a repeal, you should first prove that this was once a Gospel-institution, as you hinted in your first argument, yet I am not to seek for a repeal of that Membership, and that covenant interest that you insist upon; it was then repealed when Christ was offered up, when they weighed for his price thirty pieces of silver, *Zach.* 11. 10. then was the covenant broken that God had made wtih all the people, their Covenant priviledges then ceased, their Church-state was then dissolved, their Tabernacle fell, all their Church Ordinances were at an end; *Israel was no longer a separate people.*

That it was then repealed, may further appear, in that as soon as Christ was risen, there was a new commission given out, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark* 16. 15. according to which the Apostles were to act; the old measures that you have insisted upon were laid by, and new measures were then taken, Church-Membership was no longer a birth-priviledge; *Henceforth know we no man after the flesh*, 2 Cor. 5. a *Jew* that before was born a Church-Member was no longer accounted such, unless in the judgment

of

of Charity he was new born, 1 *Cor.* 12. *By one spirit are we all baptized into one body, and made to drink into one spirit, whether* Jew *or* Gentile. *Eph.* 4. 4. *There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: And to every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of God:* And can we think that this one baptism belongs to more than the members of that one body? The universal visible Church extends not it self beyond the limits of this one body, and there is not one uncalled and unsanctified member to be found in this body; they are all such in the judgment of Charity, and in receiving members into a particular instituted Church the Apostles keep close to the commission, *Acts* 2. 41. They first discipled, then baptized, then added unto the Church; as many as *Gladly received the word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.* The Titles given to particular Churches shew that they were Saints, such as in the judgment of charity were inherently holy, each individual member that was judged meet to stand in a Church-state was so accounted, 2 *Thes.* 1. 3. *Your faith groweth exceedingly, and the love of every one of you all aboundeth:* This is not applicable to Infants, *Phil.* 1. 5, 6, 7. *He that hath begun a good work in you, will not cease to perfect the same, as it is meet for me to think so of you all.*

Your conclusion is this, *That if the infants of Believers are still in the covenant, then they have a right to Baptism, the seal of the covenant.*

I answer, This seemeth to be diverse, if not contradictory to what precedes: *First*, You contend for entrance into the covenant by baptism: Now you make an Interest in the covenant the ground of baptism, which you say is the seal of their interest.

tereſt. Before I return you an anſwer to this, I deſire you to ſhew me the Scripture that calls baptiſm the Seal of the Covenant.

Arguments for Believers Baptiſm in oppoſition to Infant Baptiſm.

Give me leave now to offer you ſomething for Believers Baptiſm in oppoſition to Infants.

If ſuch as are diſcipled to Chriſt by the Word are the only ſubjects of baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Commiſſion, then Infants are not.

But ſuch as are diſcipled to Chriſt by the Word are the only ſubjects of Baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Commiſſion, therefore Infants are not.

The firſt Propoſition I prove thus,

Firſt, If Infants be uncapable of being diſcipled to Chriſt by the Word, then they are not the ſubjects of baptiſm according to Chriſt's commiſſion; but they are ſo, *&c.*

Secondly, If Infants be uncapable of learning Chriſt by the Word, then they are uncapable of being diſcipled to Chriſt by the Word; but they are ſo, *&c.*

Thirdly, If Infants are uncapable of learning Self-denial for Chriſt by the Word, then are they uncapable of being diſcipled to Chriſt by the Word; but they are ſo, *&c.*

The ſecond Propoſition is proved, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go, diſciple to me all nations, baptizing them*, &c. Firſt diſciple, and then baptize. That the ſubjects of baptiſm muſt be diſcipled, I ſhall add one Argument:

If the Apoſtles, who well underſtood their Lords commiſion, did firſt diſciple and then baptize, then are diſciples the only ſubjects of Baptiſm, but they did ſo, *Acts* 2. 41. This was their practice

every

every where, not one instance can be given to the contrary; there is no president of their baptizing of Infants, no, not one, and the want of a president does strongly conclude that there was no precept; now if there be neither precept nor president to be found, then is there no such thing as Infant-baptism of Divine-institution.

I come now to reply to your second Papers, which you sent to vindicate Infant-baptism, as you entitled them.

Your *Major* Proposition you say I grant, which was this, *That those that ought to admitted members of the visible church, ought to be baptized.*

Reply, Here you misrepresent it; I said, if by the visible Church you meant an instituted Church, I did grant it; I know no formal way of admitting members into the universal visible church, unless you call the preaching of the word the formal way, for those that are called out of the world by the preaching of the Word to embrace Jesus Christ, are upon their owning and professing of him, to be judged members of the universal visible Church, provided their conversation does answer their profession.

But here you say, I deny that Baptism is the formal cause of their admission; and the reason I give for it is this, that if baptism were the formal cause of Church-membership, then it must be repeated when an Excommunicated Person is restored.

To this you answer, that there is no need to repeat baptism, for Excommunication does not wholly unchurch a person, or make him no member of the Church.

Reply, Here I must take your own word, for you offer no proof to it, and your bare word cannot in the least shake my Argument; and now give

me

me leave to tell you, that a person justly excommunicated is not only cut off from communion, but is cast out from being a member of that particular body in which he once stood, 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. *Wherefore put away from among your selves that wicked person:* Mat. 28. 17. *Let him be to thee as an Heathen Man or a Publican.*

Your *Minor* Proposition you say was this, *But the children of believers ought to be entred into covenant with God, and admitted members of the visible Church.* This you say I deny, though I grant that the covenant of God made with *Abraham* took in his Children, and that they were Church-Members under the Law. You say, the reason of my denial is this, because the administration is changed, the Gospel-administration differs from that under the Law, so that it does not follow that the children of Believers are now to be admitted by Baptism. Your answer to this is, that the covenant of grace is differently administred under the Law and Gospel, but those different administrations do not make the covenant different.

Reply, *First*, Here is a grant given that the administration is changed, and if so, then must we take our measures from the law of the new administration, and not from the old.

Secondly, I grant the covenant of Grace to be the same; that which I denied was, that the covenant which was signed with circumcision was the covenant of Grace.

Secondly, You say, the covenant that God made with *Abraham* and his seed was the Gospel-Covenant.

Reply, I never denied that neither, (if by his seed are intended his spiritual seed) that which I denied was, that the covenant God made with *Abrahnm*

and

and his natural seed, (considered as such) was the covenat of Grace.

You say, it was the Gospel Covenant, and that God promised to be a God to him, and to his seed after him, implying that he would afford to them that were in covenant with him all blessings that could be expected from a gracious God, *Gen.* 17.7.

Reply, *First*, I grant that covenant *Gen.* 17. 7. to be the covenant of Grace; but here take notice, the seed were his spiritual seed, not his natural, considered as such, *Verse* 45. *A Father of many nations have I made thee*: The Apostle *Rom.* 4. 16, 17. quotes this very Text, and applies it to the spiritual seed.

Secondly, God hath here made himself over to be their God, absolutely to bestow on them all blessings that might be expected from a gracious God, and what can these be less than Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification? And if so, these two things will follow: *First*, That none of the subjects of this covenant shall miss of either of these blessings. *Secondly*, That such of *Abraham*'s seed that go without these blessings were never the subjects of this covenant.

Thirdly, You say, the covenant that God made with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 17.7. is more likely to be the covenant of Grace than that *Gen.* 15. 18. which I grant to be the covenant of Grace.

Reply, This is your mistake, in saying, I granted that covenant *Gen.* 15. to be the covenant of grace, I granted no such thing; however, I thank you for telling me that, that *Gen.* 17. 7. is more likely to be the covenant of grace than the other, for I deny the other to be the covenant of grace, for it contained temporal blesshngs only; *Unto thy seed have I given this whole land.* And now that there may be no more

more miſtakes, I will ſhew you that covenant I deny to be the covenant of Grace; it's that which God made with *Abraham* and the natural ſeed, *Gen.* 15. 18. which was again renew'd *Gen.* 17. 8. and ſo to the 15. and that was dedicated with the blood of the ſacrifices, *Exod.* 24. 8. and that was again renewed, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11. in all which places the ſubjects are the ſame, the natural ſeed, conſidered as ſuch; the inheritance the ſame, the land of *Canaan*; this is that covenant that contain'd temporal bleſſings only, that covenant that is diſtinguiſhed from the covenant of grace, *Jer.* 31. 32, 33. as appears by comparing the 32 *verſe* with *Deut.* 29. 25. this is that covenant which is diſtinct from the covenant of grace, *Heb.* 8. 6, 7. and ſo to the end, and *Heb.* 9. 16, 17, 18.

Fourthly, You ſay, that when God renewed this covenant with *Abraham*, he promiſed in more plain terms, that in *his ſeeed all the nations of the earth ſhould be bleſſed*, Gen. 22. 18.

Reply, I grant that the covenant of grace was here renewed, and that here is a promiſe of all ſpiritual bleſſings, Grace here, and Glory hereafter, which is and ſhall come upon every individual perſon that is a ſubject of that covenant: But this promiſe was made to the ſpiritual ſeed, not to the natural: This promiſe was made in Chriſt, and to thoſe only that are Chriſts; *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye Abraham's ſeed, and heirs according to the promiſe*, Gal. 3. 29. This promiſe takes not in every individual perſon of all Nations, though its ſaid all the Nations of the Earth ſhall be bleſſed, but ſuch only as are related unto Chriſt, *Gal.* 3. 8, 9, 10. *God preached the Goſpel to Abraham, ſaying, in thee ſhall all the Nations of the earth be bleſſed: So then, they that are of faith*, (that is of Chriſt, faith being taken objectively)

jectively) *are blessed with faithful Abraham: For as many as are of the works of the Law, are under the curse.* If this promise had been made to the natural seed, considered as such, not one of them should have gone without the benefit thereof. Hath God made this promise to the natural seed, and yet many of them go without the blessing thereof? How will it then harmonize with *Rom.* 4. 16. *It is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be made sure to all the seed,* &c.

Fifthly, You say that this blessing that is come on them in Christ, that is, on the *Gentiles,* is no other but the Gospel Promises and Priviledges which were made to them in Christ by covenant, *Gal.* 3. 14, 17.

Reply. This I readily grant you, but it did not come on all the *Gentiles,* but such only as were Christs, as I have shewed you already; nor did it come on all the *Jews,* but on such of them as were Christs, and if so, then it was never put into that covenant in which the natural seed stood, considered as such; for if it had, they would have enjoyed the benefit of it. And this anticipates your conclusion, which is this, that the covenant that God made with *Abraham,* which was signed with circumcision, is the covenant of Grace; for had that been the covenant into which these blessings were put, they should have come on all the natural seed, who were the subjects thereof.

Sixthly, You say, it was no other than the covenant of grace into which the *Jews* entered, *Deut.* 29. 12, 13. *That he may establish thee to be a people, and that he may be to thee a God.* And these words are used by the Prophet to express the covenant of Grace as distinct from the ceremonies of the Law, *Jer.* 7. 22, 23.

Reply. As to the *29th.* of *Deut.* I have ſpoken already, and if I muſt remind you of what I ſaid, then compare 25. with *Jer.* 31. 32, 33. and you may ſee it's diſtinct from the covenant of Grace; it was the covenant God made with them, when he brought them up out of *Egypt*, and that was not the covenant of Grace: This Note of diſtinction between the covenant *Deut.* 29. and the covenant of Grace, I gave you in my laſt; but you have not made a word of Reply; and whereas you ſay that *Jer.* doth diſtinguiſh the ceremonies of the Law from the covenant of Grace, there is not one word of the covenant of Grace in the place you have quoted; but I ſuppoſe you gather it from theſe words, *Obey my voice, and I will be your God*; but this is no more than God promiſed to the natural ſeed, by vertue of the peculiar covenant, in the ſame terms; this proves not that covenant to be the covenant of Grace: God here makes himſelf over upon Conditional Terms, but the covenant of Grace is abſolute; obedience to God is the fruit of our relation by vertue of the covenant of Grace, not the Condition: This is no more than God promiſed, *Gen.* 17. 8. Alſo, *I will give unto thee, and to thy ſeed after thee, this whole land wherein thou art a ſtranger, and I will be their God.*

This Covenant contained temporal bleſſings only, and the moſt of them hung on conditions too, *Deut.* 28. Now for God to be their God by vertue of this Covenant, was but to make good the promiſes thereof; if they ſhould break Covenant by their diſobedience, as they might, *Gen.* 17. 14. and as they did, *Jer.* 31. 32. God was at liberty to give them a bill of divorce, as he threatned in the place you laſt quoted, *Jer.* 7. 28, 29. *Thou ſhalt ſay unto them, this is a Nation that obeyeth not the voice*

of

of the Lord their God, nor receiveth correction; truth is perished and cut off from their mouth: Cut off thy hair, O Jerusalem, take up a lamentation, for the Lord hath rejected and forsaken the generation of his wrath. And is this the covenant of Grace, the subjects of which may be forsaken? and are these the subjects of the covenant of grace, that the Lord calls the generation of his wrath, and whose Carcasses he threatens shall be meat for the fowls of the Air? These are curses, and not New-covenant blessings, that were to fall upon them, *Hos.* 1. 7. *Call his name Loammi, for ye are not my people, neither will I be your God:* And yet he was once their God by vertue of this peculiar covenant; but when God makes himself over unto a people by vertue of the covenant of Grace, he is their God for ever, *Jer.* 32. 40.

Seventhly, You say, if this be not the covenant of Grace, then the covenant of Grace was not established under the Law.

Reply. It does not follow that the covenant of Grace was not established under the Law, if this be denied to be the covenant of Grace; the one may be denied, the other granted: What I have written already, shews that I own the covenant of Grace to be from the beginning, to be established with *Abraham* and his spiritual seed, *Gen.* 17. 7. and to be confirmed, *Gen.* 22. 18. In the next place you come to examine the differences that I laid down between this covenant and the covenant of Grace.

SECT. I.

THe first you say is this, That the covenant that God made with the *Jews*, was a Covenant that might be broken, that it contained cur-

ſes as well as bleſſings, that might fall on the ſubjects thereof without a ſanctified uſe of them; but the covenant of Grace can't be broken, and that it contains only bleſſings. This you ſay is a ſtrange property of the covenant of Grace, that it cannot be broken, and that there had need be more proof to it than my bare ſay ſo, to perſwade any reaſonable man to believe it.

Reply. You had more than my bare ſay ſo to prove it, if you would but have caſt your eye upon it; and I think more than you can anſwer, becauſe you ſlipt it without a reply. I gave you for the proof of it, *Jer.* 32.40. *I will make an everlaſting covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good, and I will put my fear into their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from me.* If God will never turn away from the ſubjects of this covenant to do them good, then he will always ſtand by them to do them good, and to do them all the good that they need, or can expect from a God of Grace and Mercy; and if he will put his fear into their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from him, then let any rational man tell me how this covenant can be broken. But ſeeing there wants ſo much proof to a truth ſo plain and clear, I ſhall endeavour to put it beyond diſpute.

Firſt, It cannot be broken on Gods part, *Heb.* 6. 17, 18. *God willing more abundantly to ſhew to the heirs of his promiſe the immutability of his counſel, confirmed it by his Oath: That by two immutable things by which it was impoſſible for God to lye, they that had fled to lay hold on the Hope ſet before them might have ſtrong conſolation.* The Word is unchangeable, the Oath is unchangeable, and it's impoſſible for God to lye, that hath promiſed, that in *Abraham's ſeed all the Nations in the earth ſhould be bleſſed,*

Gal.

Gal. 3. 17. *And this I say, that the Covenant that was before confirmed of God in Christ, the Law that was four hundred and thirty Years after could not disanul, that it should make the Promise of none effect.* Psalm 89. 28, 29, *&c. My Mercy will I keep for him for evermore,* (that is, Christ) *and my Covenant shall stand fast with him; if his Children break my Law, and walk not in my Statutes, I will visit their Iniquities with the Rod, and their Sin with Stripes; but my loving-kindness will I not take from them, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail: My Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my Lips.* If God will not take his Love from him, then not from them that are one with him: If his Covenant shall stand fast with him for evermore, then with them that are one with him by vertue of the same Covenant. But you will say, Will not God break his Covenant, when his Children break his Laws? I answer, No, he will correct them, but not disinherit them. The breach of Gods Laws was a breach of that Covenant wherein the natural Seed stood, considered as such, but not the breach of the Covenant of Grace; wherein the Children of Christ stands, *Heb.* 9. 17. *A Testament is of force when Men are dead, otherwise it's of no force at all while the Testator liveth:* The Testator being dead, the Testament can't be altered; not one Name of those that were written in the Lambs Book of Life can be blotted out, nor one Legacy altered. If it be but a mans Covenant, when it is confirmed, no man disanuleth, or addeth thereunto. This the Apostle bringeth to shew, how unalterable the Covenant of Grace is, being confirmed by the Death of the Testator.

Secondly, It can't be broken by the Subjects thereof: Once in the Covenant of Grace, and forever.

First, All their Sins are pardoned, upon the satisfaction made by Christ their Surety, *Col.* 2. 13, 14. *And you who were dead in your Sins, and the Uncircumcision of your Flesh, hath he quickened together with Christ, having forgiven you all sins, blotting out the hand-writing of Ordinances that was against us; that was contrary to us, taking it out of the way, and nailing it unto the Cross.* This hand-writing was the Moral Law, which was written and engraven in Stone, which the Apostle calls *The Ministration of Death, that was written and ingraven in Stone*, 2 Cor. 3. 7. and which he there telleth you is done away, (I do not say that the Moral Law is done away in respect of the Precept thereof, that it should not be a rule of Life to Believers, for I acknowledge that such are still under the ruling Power thereof, as well as others; this I put down to prevent mistakes) but in respect of the Curse thereof: *He hath redeemed us from the Curse of the Law, being made a Curse for us*, Gal. 3. 13. That this was the Moral Law, appears, *First*, In that he speaks to the *Gentiles* that were not under the Ceremonial Law. *Secondly*, In that it was a Law that was against us, that it was contrary to us, it was that Law by which we were condemned, by which we were bound over to wrath; the Debt being paid by a Surety, Justice it self pleads the discharge of the Principle, gives up the Bond immediately, there is no more Charge, Action or Molestation, of or against the Principle; insomuch that there is a challenge made, *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? it's God that justifieth; who shall condemn? it's Christ that died, yea rather that is risen again.* He dates their discharge from the time of Christ's Oblation: Now the Debt paid was

not

not this or that particular Sin satisfied for, but this and that, as Sins past, present, and to come.

First, It was the design of Christ in dying to redeem from all Sin, *Tit.* 2. 14. *Who gave himself for us, that he might*, &c. Either Christ hath done what he gave himself to do, or he hath not: If he hath, then are they redeemed from all Iniquity; if he hath not, it must be for want of Merit in his Blood; and that were blasphemy to assert.

Secondly, What Christ gave himself to do, that he did, *Heb.* 10. 14. *By one oblation he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified:* This Perfection consists in the pardon of Sin; and the Word for ever shews it to be all Sin, past, present, and to come: Now where Remission of these is, there is no more sacrifice for Sin. Either Sin is remitted upon the oblation of Christ, or it is not; if it be not, it will never be remitted; for without shedding of Blood there is no Remission.

Thirdly, Those that are redeemed are eternally redeemed, never to come into Condemnation more, *Heb.* 9. 12. *He entered once into the holy place, having obtained for us eternal Redemption:* And it is with respect to the Consummation of the new Covenant by the Death of Christ, that God is said to be merciful to their unrighteousness, and to remember their Sins no more. Now then, if the Sins of those that have an interest in this Covenant are all pardoned, how can the subjects thereof break it? if this Covenant be broken, it must be by Sin, but pardoned Sin cannot break it.

Secondly, If the Sins of those that have an interest in this Covenant may break it, who then

ſhall remain intereſted in it? *In many things we offend all:* I do not judge that you do diſtinguiſh between Mortal and Venial Sins, or that there is any ſuch diſtinction to be made; Sin as Sin deſerves Death.

Thirdly, God hath promiſed to put his fear into the Hearts of the Subjects of this Covenant, that they ſhall not depart from, (that is) they ſhall not totally and finally depart from him: So that now I hope that my aſſertion ſtands good, that the Covenant of Grace can't be broken; and if ſo, then its a good note to diſtinguiſh it by; from the Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, (conſidered as ſuch) which was a Covenant that might be broken, and that was broken.

Secondly, You ſay, though God will not fail to afford us Grace, ſufficiently to enable us to keep his Covenant, *Jer.* 32. 40. yet it is too poſſible for us, through our own default, to receive his Grace in vain.

Reply. If God will never turn away from us to do us good, but will put his fear into our Hearts, that we ſhall not depart from him, then it is not poſſible for us to receive his Grace in vain; and if you intend for the proof of your Aſſertion, 2 *Cor.* 6. 1. that will be no evidence for you in this matter: It's not the infuſion of Grace, but the Doctrine of Grace that is there intended, as appears by the Coherence, and that I grant may be received in vain; and is, when it is received into the Head, but not into the Heart; when it is received in the Notion, but not in the Life and Power thereof.

Thirdly, You ſay, God doth not compel us to be good, nor to obey any of his Laws, without our own endeavour.

Reply.

Reply. God doth not compel us againſt our Will, I grant; that is not the way that God taketh; but he doth by a Work of Regeneration alter and change our Will, and makes us of unwilling to be willing, *Pſalm* 110. 3. *Thy People ſhall be willing in the day of thy Power:* This New-Covenant Promiſe reacheth all the Subjects thereof.

Secondly, The Heart muſt be changed by the infuſion of new Principles, before we can heartily endeavour, or can pleaſe God in what we do, *Rom.* 8. 7. *The carnal Mind is enmity againſt God, and is not ſubject unto the Law of God, neither indeed can be:* Now this change of the Heart is a New-Covenant Bleſſing, which all the ſubjects thereof ſhall in time enjoy, *Ezek.* 36. 26. *A new Heart alſo will I give unto you*, &c. This Promiſe is made to all the ſpiritual *Iſrael*, and to them only, *Heb.* 8. 10, 11. *This is the Covenant that I will make with the houſe of Iſrael, I will write my Law in their Hearts*, &c. an inſeparable Companion of which is the pardon of all their Sins, *ver.* 34.

Fourthly, You ſay, we may through our own perverſe Wills refuſe his Counſel, and abuſe his Grace, *Prov.* 1. 24, 28, 29.

Reply. I grant where the Goſpel is afforded, Sinners as Sinners have a call to come to Jeſus Chriſt; and I do not ſcruple to ſay, it is a gracious call, which yet may be abuſed by the moſt of thoſe that are within the ſound thereof: *Many are called, but few are choſen.* Yet there is not one of the ſubjects of this Covenant that ſhall go without an Effectual Call, *Rom.* 8. 29. There is not one link of that golden Chain that ſhall ever fail, *John* 10. 16. *And other Sheep I have, that are not of this fold, them alſo I muſt bring, and there ſhall*

be

be one Shepherd, and one Fold. John 6. 37. *All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me.*

Fifthly, You say, that there are too many that forsake their own Mercy, and transgress the Gospel to their own Destruction.

Reply. A Gospel Call is their own Mercy: *Israel* had a day; *If thou hadst known in this, thy day*; it was their own day; the great Gospel-command hath been, and is transgressed, and men shall be damned for that Transgression. You bring a great many Scriptures here, to prove that the Gospel Covenant may be broken, and that it threatens a curse for the breach thereof; I say, you bring a great many Scriptures, such as these, to prove this, 2 *Thess.* 1. 8. *He shall come in flaming Fire, rendering vengeance on them that know not God, nor obey the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ,* &c. But do you look on these to be the subjects of the Covenant of Grace? sure I am, it is not your bare say so will clear it; there is only one Text that need to be considered, and that is *Heb.* 10. 28, 29. *And have troden under foot the Son of God, and have counted the Blood of the Covenant, wherewith they were sanctified, an unholy thing, and have done despite to the Spirit of Grace.*

Reply. This can't be taken of real Sanctification, but of Sanctification in appearance, unless we interfere with other Scriptures, *Phil.* 1. 6. *He that hath begun a good work in you, will not cease to perfect the same, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ:* Where Christ begins a work of Sanctification, he will finish it; if he hath given the Soul living water, it shall be in him a Well of Water, springing up to Everlasting Life: And if such as have made a Profession, and seemed to be sanctified, do totally and finally fall away, it may be said of them,

them, as the Apostle speaks, *They are gone out from us, but they were not all of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us; but they went out from us, that it might be manifest that they were not all of us:* But who were they then? I answer, the Children of *Hagar*, not of *Sarah*; the Sons of the Bond-woman, not of the Free.

You Query, Do not these Scriptures prove, that the Covenant of Grace may be broken, and that it threatens a curse for the breach thereof?

Reply. They prove that the commands of the Gospel may be transgressed by wicked men, and that they shall be damned for that Transgression; but they do not prove, that the Covenant may be broken by the subjects thereof.

Seventhly, You Query, If the Covenant may not be broken, how can any Man be damned that professes the Gospel, though he walk contrary to that Profession, seeing he is condemned for nothing, but for breaking of the Gospel-Covenant?

Reply. I would ask again, How those may be said to break the Covenant, that never had an interest in it? and how it appears that such as are damned had ever an interest in the Covenant of Grace? they were none of Christs Sheep; for if they had, they should have heard Christ's Voice, and have followed him, and should have had Eternal Life, *John* 10. 27,28. *My Sheep hear my Voice, and I give to them Eternal Life, and they shall never perish*, &c. And if they are none of Christ's, then they are none of *Abraham's* Seed, and so not heirs according to Promise.

Secondly, How doth it appear, that wicked men are condemned for breaking of this Covenant? Where does the Scripture say, that their Condemnation is for the breach of the Covenant of Grace? That of the *Hebrews* will not reach it:

Men

Men may trample under foot the Blood of the Covenant, by despising of Jesus Christ, and by rejecting of him, that had never an interest in him, and may have the denomination of sanctified ones, that were never really sanctified. All the Churches of Christ are stiled Saints, professing themselves such, though there are Hypocrites among them: And if men do totally and finally fall from their Profession, its an evident demonstration that they were never really sanctified, that they were never regenerated, never born of God, nor had ever an interest in the Covenant of Grace.

First, That they were never born of God, 1 *John* 3. 9. *He that is born of God doth not commit Sin, neither can he, for his Seed remaineth in him.* He can't yield the full Consent of his Will, nor Sin with constant allowance; *It's the thing that I would not, that I do*; saith the Apostle, *Rom.* 7. If men Sin willingly after they have received the Knowledge of the Truth, as these do, *Heb.* 10. its a sure sign that they were never born of God, and if they were never born of God, they were never really sanctified.

Secondly, It's a sure sign that they had never an interest in the Covenant of Grace: Such as have an interest in this Covenant, are secured by the Promises thereof from total and final Apostacy, *Jer.* 32. 40. *John* 10. 27, 28, 29. *Mat.* 16. 18. *Upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it:* Its the House that's built upon the Sand that falls, not the House that's built upon the Rock; every true Believer is built upon this Rock.

SECT.

SECT. II.

YOu say, the second difference that I make between these two Covenants is this, that into which the *Jews* entred with their Seed was conditional, but the Covenant of Grace is absolute. Here you grant the former, and deny the latter. You say the Covenant of Grace is conditional:

Reply. These Terms I suppose are inconsistent; if it be the Covenant of Grace, then its not conditional; if it be conditional, then its not the Covenant of Grace, *Rom.* 11. 6. *If it be of Grace, then it's no more of Works, otherwise Grace is no more Grace; and if it be of Works, then it's no more of Grace, otherwise Works are no more Works:* So that unless the Nature of these two are changed, Grace and Works, as Conditions, will not stand together.

Secondly, You say, a Covenant necessarily implies a mutual Obligation; and as God in the Covenant promiseth blessings on his part, so he requires Conditions on our part, in order to obtain those blessings.

Reply. First, I deny that a mutual Obligation is essential to a Covenant, as such, though it may be to some Covenants; a Covenant may be made without it, *Gen.* 9. God made a Covenant with all Flesh, as well irrational as rational, the Token of which Covenant you have seen. This Covenant is absolute, there could be no Condition required of, nor performed by irrational Creatures, in order to obtain the Blessings; and should rational Creatures be as wicked, yea, more wicked then they were before the Flood, yet has the

Lord

Lord bound himself by this Covenant, that he will drown the World no more. Again, we have the Lords Covenant with the Day, and with the Night, *Jer.* 33. 20. That they should continue for ever in their season; but where the mutual obligation lies, I do not know.

Secondly, A Covenant may be made between two, for, and in behalf of others, wherein they mutually engage to each other; as that between *Laban* and *Jacob*, in behalf of *Laban*'s Daughters, *Gen.* 31. 5. which Covenant was absolute with respect to the Subjects thereof, that *Jacob* should not abuse them, nor take other Wives to them. Such is the Covenant of Grace, it was transacted between the Father and the Son, for, and in behalf of the Elect, *Isa.* 49. from 1, to 11. wherein there is a mutual engagement between the Father and the Son, both for Redemption, Vocation, and Glorification, *Tit.* 1. 2. *In hopes of Eternal Life, which God that cannot lye promised before the World was:* Whom could this Promise be made to but Christ, and for whom could it be made but the Elect? How could *Paul* have bottomed his Hopes on the Promise, if he had not had an Interest in it? 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Who hath saved us, and called us, not according to our Works, but according to his own purpose and Grace, which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the World was.:* This Grace of God, which was the original cause of all good, was made over to a peculiar People, before the Creation of the World, which Gift was free and absolute; it was given to all those, and only those, who in time are saved and called.

Thirdly, You say, that God requireth Conditions to be performed by us, in order to obtain his Blessings.

Reply.

Reply. That there are duties required of the Subjects of this Covenant, I grant; that these are Conditions, I deny; for whatever God requires of the Subjects of this Covenant, he hath promised to give them a Heart to perform, and that must be made good on Gods part, antecedent to any thing done by them, that is any way pleasing unto God: *Without Faith it's impossible to please God*; and Faith they have not till God gives them a new Heart; *So then they that are in the Flesh cannot please God*, Rom. 8. 8. I say, what God requires of them, he hath promised to give them an Heart to do, *Ezek.* 36. 26, 27.

Secondly, If God requires Conditions of us, then these Conditions must be performed, antecedent to the receiving of the Blessings; and who then shall ever be the better for them, who hath given to God first?

Thirdly, A new Heart is one of God's blessings, *Ezek.* 36. 26. A Will to do what God requires is one of Gods Blessings, *Psalm* 110. 3. and what can be performed acceptable unto God, before these Blessings are given out?

Fourthly, When God gives out these Blessings, he doth not bestow them on us for what we have done, *Tit.* 3. 5. nor yet according to what we have done, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9.

Fourthly, You say, the Covenant on Gods part hath this Seal; *the Lord knoweth who are his*, he will own and reward them that are faithful to him.

Reply. That God will own and reward them that are faithful, I grant to be a great Truth, but I can't think it's the genuine Sense of this Text; the Text tells you, *The Foundation of God standeth sure, having this Seal, the Lord knoweth who are*

are his: This I look upon to be his decree of Election, which was his Foundation-Act of Grace, that ſtandeth ſure, and the Seal is his Knowledge of them; he knoweth whom he hath choſen, and he will own them, ſtand by them, and preſerve them in an apoſtatizing-time. And though *Hymeneus* and *Philetus*, who once ſeemed as Stars of the greateſt magnitude, had by their Apoſtacy diſcovered themſelves to be but Comets, yet ſuch as God had choſen ſhould be preſerved.

Fifthly, You ſay, that we on our part ſet to our Seal, and oblige our ſelves to depart from Iniquity.

Reply. If you caſt your Eye again on the Text, you may ſee that it's the Lord that obligeth us to depart from Iniquity; its not hiſtorical, but preceptive; *And let every one that nameth the Name of Chriſt, depart from Iniquity.*

Sixthly, You ſay, that place *Jer.* 31. 33. expreſly declares the Condition of the new Covenant, both on Gods part and ours too, that he will be our God, and we ſhall be his People.

Reply. I think a man muſt be very quick-ſighted, that can eſpy a Condition in a Text that is wholly promiſſory; he muſt needs be a very great Artiſt, that can turn a Priviledge into a Condition; *I will be their God, and they ſhall be my People*; its a choice Promiſe, and holds out the Priviledge of the Subjects thereof; you may as well make the next Words a Condition as theſe; *They ſhall all know me, from the greateſt to the leaſt*; and if you do, by the People of God underſtand ſuch as are his by Vocation, then their call is here promiſed, they ſhall be my People; but how ſhall this be effected? the Text tells you; *I will write my Law in their Hearts, and put it in their inward parts*: This is that that doth

doth disposé them to answer a Gospel-call; this is absolutely promised, and what farther Assistance may be needed shall not be wanting; those that God loved with an everlasting love he will draw unto Christ with cords of Love; he hath engaged to afford them the Assistance of his Spirit to enable them to answer a Gospel-call.

Seventhly, You say, that to approve our selves to be the people of God, we must not only believe his Promises, but obey his Will, and walk in his ways.

Reply. Must all these be done antecedent to our relation, and as conditions of our relation to God? that all these are matter of duty, and that they are the means by which we approve our selves to be the people of God, both to our selves and others too, I grant, but that they are conditions entitling us to God, as our God, I deny. You say unless we be obedient unto God, and behave our selves as his people, he will not be our God to bless us, and to crown us with Happiness.

Reply. First, God must bless us with a principle of Obedience, before we can yield an act of Obedience; that is, an act of sincere Obedience; and if it be not sincere, it's neither acceptable unto God, nor spiritually profitable unto our selves. *The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject unto the Law of God, neither indeed can be:* So that an act of Obedience is not antecedent to the blessing, and therefore not a condition thereof; and tho' obedience be antecedent to happiness, (by which I suppose you intend a Crown of Glory) yet it is not the condition of that happiness. Glory may be considered as an end following obedience, preparing, fitting for and disposing to it, but not as an end depending on obedience, as a means procuring.

Eighthly, You say the great blessings of the Gospel are promised on condition of Faith, and sincere Obedience.

Reply. Here I would query, Whether Faith and sincere Obedience be not great Gospel Blessings themselves, or whether they will be found to grow in Natures Garden? must not the heart first be changed, before a man can believe, or yield sincere obedience? the essence of Faith lyeth in the act of the Understanding, and of the Will, neither of which can be put forth till the heart be renewed, the understanding can't behold Jesus Christ; *The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, nor can he know them, for they are spiritually discerned:* And such a one wants a spiritual eye, 1 *John* 5. 1. *He that believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God; to know God to be the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent, is the gift of Jesus Christ*, John 17. 2, 3. and this gift is bestowed on them only that are given unto Jesus Christ: And as for the act of the Will, that also is a New-covenant blessing, *Psal.* 110. 3. *Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.* And what is sincere Obedience but a New-Covenant-blessing also, a fruit of the free-grace of God? *Phil.* 2. 13. *It's God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his own good pleasure:* I doubt not but faith and sincere obedience may be called great blessings of the Gospel as well as others, and what I pray are the conditions on which these are bestowed?

Ninthly, You bring three places to prove this, that Faith and Obedience are the conditions on which the great blessings of the Gospel are given out, *Acts* 10. 43. *He that beleiveth shall receive remission of sins.*

Reply. It's one thing for sins to be remitted, and another

another thing for a person to receive remission. Sin was remitted from the time of Christ's oblation, (as I shewed you in the preceeding head) remission of sin lyes in our reconciliation, 2 *Cor.* 5. *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing unto them their trespasses*; then was the Attonement made, but we receive the Attonement when we believe, *Rom.* 5. 11. *By whom also we have now received the Attonement*: Our receiving remission is not the condition of our pardon, that was procured by Christ long before; that of *Prov.* 28. 18. shews us the way in which God will be found; *He that confesseth his sin, and forsaketh it, shall find mercy*. God doth not set his grace and mercy to sale, he pardoneth freely; repentance is not the condition of pardon, but the way to attain the sence thereof. The other Scripture, 1 *John* 2.7. is plainly an evidence, not a condition; *He that doth righteousness is righteous, as he is righteous*.

Tenthly, You say, without obedience we shall never enter into happiness; *Without holiness none shall see the Lord*.

Reply. This is readily granted, yet is not the holiness and obedience of sanctified ones the condition of their interest in the covenant, but the fruit thereof.

Eleventhly, You say, that God will not pardon sins while we continue impenitent; *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness of men*, Rom. 1. 18.

Reply. That the wrath of God is revealed from Heaven, is granted, and the greatest wrath is revealed against the sins of those that are the subjects of this covenant, for whom Jesus Christ stood a surety: God laid all their sins upon Christ, *Isa.* 53. 6. and poured out all that wrath upon Christ that

was due to them, *verse* 4. *Surely he hath born our griefs, he hath carried our sorrows*, that which we should have born and carried; *he was wounded for our transgressions, and by his stripes are we healed*; all this wrath was born upon the account of the subjects of this covenant, *verse* 8. *for the transgressions of my people was he stricken.* Jesus Christ in bearing this wrath for us hath born it from us, 1 *Thes.* 1. 10. *Even Jesus who hath delivered us from the wrath to come:* When Christ was made a curse for us, then did he redeem us from the curse, in which redemption there is remission; then did he consummate that New-Covenant, *Heb.* 8. at which time God pardoned all the sins of the subjects thereof; when the Testator was dead, the Testament was of force, and from that time there is a challenge made, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? it's God that justifies*, &c. *Rom.* 8. 33.

Twelfthly, You say, if this Doctrine were generally embraced, and put in practice, it would destroy the Christian Religion.

Reply. I take this to be a hasty conclusion, which the Premises will not afford; I know no one duty destroyed by it, neither Faith nor Repentance, nor any act of Obedience, either to moral or Evangelical Precepts; there is enough for us to do, though not as conditions; though we are not bound to work for life, yet is there work enough to be done from life, and our capacity to obey where God commands is a fruit of our interest; a new heart and a new spirit, *Ezek.* 36. is a fruit of our interest; the spirit enabling us to pray is a fruit of our relation to God, *Gal.* 4. 5. *Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father.* The Doctrine of the freeness and absoluteness of this Covenant never opened a

Gap

Gap to licentiouſneſs to a gracious ſoul, though poſſibly others may abuſe it as they do the Scriptures, wreſting them to their own deſtruction. I know no Doctrine that is more binding to a gracious ſoul than the Doctrine of Free-Grace is; *It teacheth him to deny all Ungodlineſs and Worldly Luſts, and to live ſoberly, righteouſly and godly in this preſent World*, Tit. 2. 11.

SECT. III.

YOu ſay, the the third difference that I make between theſe two Covenant is this, that the one contains temporal bleſſings, the other ſpiritual; your Anſwer to this is, that though this Covenant that the *Jews* were under with their ſeed, contained a great many temporal bleſſings, yet there were ſome ſpiritual bleſſings, for God promiſed to *circumciſe their hearts, and the hearts of their children*, Deut. 30. 6. Eph. 11. 19, 20. God promiſeth to give them *One heart, and to take away the ſtony heart out of their fleſh, and to give them an heart of fleſh, that they ſhould walk in his ſtatutes, and that he would be their God, and they ſhould be his people*.

Reply. I ſuppoſe my Argument yet ſtands good, and that the ſame Anſwer may ſerve which I have given already; if this had been a branch of that covenant in which the natural ſeed ſtood, conſidered as ſuch, *Deut.* 29. then ſhould they all have enjoyed the benefit thereof. God makes no promiſe, but he performs it too.

Secondly, You ſay that many of them refuſed to perform the conditions on which theſe promiſes were made, and therefore they went without the benefit thereof.

Reply. Firſt, You do not declare what thoſe

conditions were, nor do I know what conditions may be performed antecedent to a new heart: If you say it was sincere obedience, which is the likeliest to be pitched upon, there lies the Proposal, *Deut.* 30. 2. *If thou shalt return, and obey the voice of the Lord, according to all that I command thee, thou and thy children, with all thy heart and with all thy soul:* Is this the condition? if it be, then were they under an impossibility to perform it; this can't be done without heart-circumcision, antecedent thereunto: *The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject unto the law of God, neither indeed can be,* Rom. 8. 7. Men can't obey the law of God till God write his law in their hearts, they can't observe his judgments till he puts his spirit within them, so that heart-circumcision that follows sincere obedience can't be understood of the first work of sanctification, but of a farther carrying on of the work thereof.

Secondly, If you read the Book of the covenant, *Exod.* 21, 22, 23. *Chapters.* You will find no such promise there; that these Chapters contained the book of the Covenant, appears, *Exod.* 24. 8. if you read the 28*th.* of *Deut.* where you have a list of all the blessings of this covenant, you will find no such promise there, and yet *Moses* tells them *Chap.* 29. 1. These are the Words of the covenant that the Lord commanded him to make with them; and in the 25 *verse.* you may see that this was the Covenant the Lord made with them when they came out of *Egypt*; by which note its distingished from the covenant into which heart-circumcision was put, *Jer.* 31, 32, 33. and as for that promise that God made of a heart to walk in his statutes, *Ezek.* 11. 19, 20. it was made to a peculiar people that God had among the *Jews*, or to the spiritual seed:

If

If one Scripture may help to interpret another, *Jer.* 24. This promise was made to the good figs, not to the evil; there is a fearful curse threatned against them; it was the same captivity that *Ezekiel* relates to.

SECT. IV.

YOu say, the fourth Difference that I make between these two covenants, is in respect of the subjects: The subjects of the one being the natural seed of *Abraham*, considered as such, the subjects of the other being the spiritual seed, true Members of Christ, really regenerate and holy: But this exposition of the Members of Christ is your own, and not mine: To this you say, that the difference between the Covenant of Grace under the Law, and under the Gospel, is not so great as to make them different Covenants.

Reply. I know no difference in the Covenant of Grace then and now, nor did I endeavour to make any, I only distinguish the Covenant of Grace from that Covenant that the natural seed were in, considered as such.

Secondly, You say, that all that were admitted into the Church of the *Jews*, and professed that religion, were in the covenant of Grace; and all that are admitted into the Church of Christ, and profess that religion that he hath taught, are in the covenant of Grace, under the Evangelical Administration; and much to this purpose you have brought, without one Text of Scripture to prove it, therefore I shall let it pass till I come to your Scriptures.

Thirdly, You say, there are many promises of Pardon and Salvation, which are special parts

of the Gospel-Covenant made to the wicked, on condition of repentance, as *Isa.* 55. 7. *Ezek.* 15. 29.

Reply. First, The offer of the promise is to all where the Gospel comes, but its one thing to have the offer, and another thing to have an interest in the promise.

Secondly, The Promises, though offered unto all, yet are made to none but the spiritual seed; to *Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not to seeds, as of many, but unto thy seed, as of one, which is Christ*, Gal. 3. 16.

Fourthly, You say, that those of the natural seed that were not the Children of God, *Rom.* 9. were such as rejected Christ, and sought Justification by the works of the Law.

Reply. I grant they rejected Christ, but this Answer is besides the Question; the Question is, Whether they had an interest in the promise? they were the Children of *Abraham*, but not the Children of the Promise, which were accounted for the Seed.

Secondly, How came they to reject Christ? Was it not because they had no Interest in the Promise, no Relation unto Jesus Christ? I suppose Christ bottoms it there, *John* 10. 26. *Ye believe not, because ye are not my Sheep, as I said unto you.* The Covenant of Grace was made with *Israel*, Jer. 31. 33. *But all are not Israel that are of Israel; Not as though the Word of God has taken none effect:* Those to whom God hath promised Grace, to them he gives it; but that was to *Israel*, not all of *Israel.* I mentioned *Jacob* and *Esau* too, the one loved, and the other hated; and put the Question, Whether a Person hated of God, might be considered a subject of the Covenant of Grace? I like-

likewiſe mentioned *Gal.* 3. 16, 29. *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to Promiſe:* I ſhewed you, that *Abraham* had but two Seeds, a natural and a ſpiritual Seed; that the *Gentiles* are not his natural Seed, nor can they be known to be his ſpiritual Seed, till they walk in the ſteps of *Abraham*'s Faith; but there is no reply to all this.

Firſt, You Query, if formal Profeſſors have no Intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, how then can they be ſaid to tranſgreſs it?

Reply. I know not where it's ſo ſaid, though I deny not but Goſpel-laws are broken by them.

Secondly, You Query, how they could have any hope of Mercy and Salvation, in caſe they repent, if they have no Intereſt in the Covenant?

Reply. I never denied, that thoſe have an Intereſt in the Covenant, that do in time come truly to repent; that which I deny, is, that thoſe which live and die impenitently had ever an Intereſt in the Covenant of Grace.

Thirdly, You Query, if none have an Intereſt in the Covenant but the ſpiritual Seed of *Abraham*, ſuch as are truly regenerated, then how could any upon ſure grounds be admitted into the Church by Baptiſm?

Reply. I know none but ſuch as are for Infant-Baptiſm, that do make Intereſt in the Covenant the ground thereof, nor any ground they have ſo to do as yet, though you have written ſo many Lines about it. We ſay, a true Faith gives the Subject a right to challenge it, a Profeſſion of that Faith gives a call to the Adminiſtrator to adminiſter it, and his Authority ſo to do is from the Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28.

Secondly, I deny that ever I ſaid, that none but thoſe

those that are truly regenerate are the subjects of the Covenant, (that is, those to whom the Promises are made) and now that I may prevent this mistake for the future, I shall shew you, who they are that I do own to be the Subjects of this Covenant.

The Subjects of the Covenant of Grace are the Elect of God, that are given unto Jesus Christ; and here I shall premise two things: *First*, That there are an Elect People, a Particular People, that God hath chosen in Christ out of the Mass of Mankind, before the Foundation of the World, unto Salvation as the end, and to Sanctification as the means.

First, They are chosen to Salvation as the end, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13. *God hath chosen you to Salvation from the beginning:* Eph. 1. 4. *According as he hath chosen us in him, before the Foundation of the World, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in Love.* There are four things which lie in the very surface of the Text: *First*, This choice is of particular Persons, *Paul* and the *Ephesians*. *Secondly*, They were chosen in Christ. *Thirdly*, This choice was before the Foundation of the World. *Fourthly*, It was that they should be Holy, not upon a foresight that they would be Holy. Holiness is an effect of Election, not the cause.

Secondly, These Elect were given unto Christ, *John* 17. *Thine they were, and thou gavest them unto me:* This Gift of the Father to the Son was antecedent to the Knowledge of God, and Jesus Christ given to them by the Son, *John* 17. 2, 3. *That I may give Eternal Life to as many as thou hast given unto me:* Some men are the Sheep of Christ, some men are not the Sheep of Christ, when both are Unbelievers, *John* 10. 16. compared with the 26. verse.

verse. I shall now prove, that these are the subjects of this Covenant.

First, It appears, in that the Blessings of this Covenant belong to them, *Eph.* 1. 3. *Who hath blessed us with all spiritual Blessings in Christ, according as he hath chosen us in him:* They have a Title unto all, and in time shall enjoy all, when all others will fall short of it, *Rom.* 11. 5. *What then Israel hath not obtained, that which it sought after, but the Election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded.*

Secondly, It was for their sakes that Christ had his Name *Jesus* given to him: *Thou shalt call his Name Jesus, for he shall save his People from their Sins*, Mat. 1. 21. his People before they were a saved People.

Thirdly, It was upon their account that Christ underwent all his Sufferings, *John* 10. 15. *I lay down my Life for the Sheep:* Isa. 53. 8. *For the Transgressions of my People was he stricken: He loved the Church, and gave himself for them:* Eph. 5. 25. *For their sakes he sanctified himself:* John 17. 19. *He prayed for them, he prayed not for the World, but for them that were given him of the Father*; and if he prayed not for the World, I conclude he died not for the World.

Fourthly, It appears, in that those only are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham* to whom the Promises were made, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.* These, and these only are the Persons that in time come to believe, *John* 6. 37. *All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me:* John 10. 16. *Other Sheep I have that are not of this Fold, them also I must bring*; shew me a true Believer, and I will shew you an Elect Person: So then, I conclude with you, that the regenerate are not the only

sub-

ſubjects of the Covenant of Grace. There were more Marks of difference that I gave you of theſe two Covenants, among which this was one, the Covenant of Grace was *a better Covenant, eſtabliſhed on better Promiſes.* There can't be a degree of compariſon where there is but one. I ſhewed in what reſpects the Promiſes were better, but you were pleaſed to paſs all without a reply, and to conclude from what was written, that there was no ſuch difference between the Covenant of Grace and that Covenant that the natural Seed were in, but that in ſubſtance it was the ſame, though the Premiſes were far enough from being cleared.

SECT. V.

YOU come now to challenge a repeal of Childrens Church-memberſhip, though you had it before; I told you it was then repealed, when the Covenant by which they were conſtituted a Church was broken, *Zach.* 11. 10. I ſhewed you, there was a new Commiſſion given out after Chriſt was riſen, according to which the Apoſtles were to act, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20.

Your Anſwer to this, is, that the Ceremonial Law is ſometimes called the firſt and old Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 7, 13. the Jewiſh ſhadows vaniſhed, their carnal Ordinances and Sacrifices ceas'd.

Reply. The Apoſtle here ſpeaks of the Covenant it ſelf, and not of the Ceremonial Law, as diſtinct from the Covenant: Though I deny not, but when the Covenant was aboliſhed, the Ordinances were aboliſhed too, which Ordinances were but the adjuncts of the firſt Covenant, diſtinct from the Eſſence, *Heb.* 9. 1. Then verily

the

the first Covenant had also Ordinances of Divine Worship, *&c.* to make the Covenant here to be but the Ordinances, is to destroy the Sence; then it must be read thus, then verily the first Administration had also an Administration, or the first Tabernacle had also a Tabernacle.

Again, to take *Heb.* 8. 7. for the Ordinances, is to reflect upon God himself, who tells you it was not faultless; take it of the Ordinaces, and then they must either be positively faulty, or privatively faulty: Positively faulty they were not, for they were Gods own appointments; privatively faulty they were not, for they did answer the end for which they were appointed; they did shadow out Jesus Christ, the Elect were brought to a sight of Christ by them, not one of them miscarried; but the Covenant it self was faulty, not positively, for it was a good Covenant, though not so good as the new Covenant, yet it answered all the ends of God in making it; one great end of which (as I conceive) was the keeping the Seed of *Abraham* in an entire Body, till the Messiah was brought forth, that it might appear that God had made good his Promise made to *Abraham*, that in his Seed all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed; but though this Covenant was sufficient to answer all the ends for which it was made, yet it was not sufficient to answer all the ends of God, to relieve all the necessities of his People. Pardon, and Peace and Reconciliation, a new Heart, and a new Spirit, Grace here, and Glory hereafter, were never put into this Covenant: *If there had been a Law given that could have given Life, verily Righteousness should have been by the Law.* Dr. *Owen* well observes upon this place, that though many of *Israel* that were under this Covenant went to Heaven,

yet

yet there was not one of them that went to Heaven by vertue of this Covenant, but by vertue of the Covenant of Grace; if this Covenant had been faultleſs, then ſhould no place have been ſought for the ſecond; this ſecond Covenant is a better Covenant, eſtabliſhed on better Promiſes; Promiſes, *That God will write his Law in their Hearts, that he will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more.* If theſe are the better Promiſes that the new Covenant is eſtabliſhed upon, then they were not in the firſt, for if theſe Promiſes had been in the firſt Covenant, that Covenant would have been as good as the ſecond, and the ſame Promiſes would have been as good in the firſt Covenant as in the ſecond; and this firſt Covenant which is ſaid to be old, *ver.* 13. is diſtinguiſhed from the Covenant of Grace, *verſe* 9. by that ſame Mark that I have mentioned already; it was the Covenant he made with them, when he brought them up out of *Egypt*, which was that ſame Covenant that he made with them *Deut.* 29. 10, 11. as appears *verſe* 25. and yet ſtill you proceed to prove, that the Covenant laſt mentioned is the Covenant of Grace, by comparing *Gen.* 17. 7. with *Deut.* 29. 13. *Heb.* 8. 10. but ſeeing it is ſo near at hand, I ſhall return no other anſwer but this, pray compare *Heb.* 8. 9. with *Deut.* 29. 25. and conſider what I have laſt written, and you may ſee that they are diſtinct Covenants.

Secondly, You ſay, you grant that the legal Ordinances being repealed, there was a new Adminiſtration of the Covenant of Grace, eſtabliſhed by our Saviour after his Reſurrection.

Reply. In granting a repeal of the legal Ordinances, you grant a repeal of the Jewiſh Church-ſtate, in which their Children ſtood members, and

now

now hence forward you must prove their Church-membership by this new Administration that is established by Christ, the old Administration being out of doors, granted by your self. Its ridiculous for a man that grants the change of the Administration, to look to that which is done away; in this new Administration there is a new Constitution of Churches; the Church was national under the legal Administration, it's Congregational under the Evangelical; then all *Judea*, and I may say all the Regions round about, were but one Church; but now there were Churches in *Judea*, *Gal.* 1. 22. We read of the Churches of *Galatia*, 1 *Cor.* 16. nothing lies plainer in the Word than this, that Churches are now Congregational, the matter whereof is visible Saints, and the form mutual Agreement, neither of which are Children in an Infant-state capable of; and if you can give me but one Instance by any one clear Text, that ever one Child was received into any one of these Churches in an Infant-state, I will give you the cause.

Thirdly, You say, you do likewise grant, that the chief Commission that the Apostles received from Christ, was to make Disciples by Instruction, and then to receive them into the Church by Baptism.

Reply. Their receiving into the Church by Baptism I have excepted against already, and have given my reasons to the contrary; but here is a grant, that the chief Commission that the Apostles had from Christ, was to make Disciples by Instruction, antecedent unto Baptism; but if this was not the only Commission, then pray shew me another; and if there be another, either it's larger, (with respect to the subjects of Baptism) or it is shorter; if it be larger, then this is not

the

the chief; if it be ſhorter, it will not relieve you: But I believe there is no other that takes in Infants; if there had, if I had not found it my ſelf, I ſhould have heard of it by you e're this time.

Thirdly, You ſay, the Apoſtles were ſent to convert Aliens to the Faith, and ſo the *Jews* being Aliens were to be diſciples unto Chriſt before they were baptized; and though the *Jews* were members of the Church, and ſubjects of the Covenant of Grace under the legal Adminiſtration, yet they were not members of the Chriſtian Church, and ſubjects of the Covenant of Grace, according to the Goſpel Adminiſtration, till they were converted to the Chriſtian Faith, and made Diſciples of Chriſt.

Reply. (Setting aſide their Intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, of which there has been enough ſpoken already) I know not what more can be granted; as to the repeal of the Jewiſh Church-ſtate, and of that memberſhip which Children once had, and were the controverſie here to end, I ſuppoſe any unbiaſſed man would judge you had given up the cauſe; but you revive it again on the old bottom.

Fourthly, You ſay, that when believing Parents are baptized, and received into the Chriſtian Church, their Children with them are intereſted in the Covenant of Grace, not by Nature, but by Vertue of God's Ordinance; for *Peter* ſaith, *The Promiſe is to you, and to your Children*, Acts 2. 39.

Reply. What right the Children are here ſaid to have, they had before their Parents did repent and were baptized, and received members of the Church; the Exhortation was to every one of them, *repent, and be baptized*; the Motive to enforce the

the Exhortation was this, *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*; so that this right did not descend to the Children by the Ordinance of God, upon the Parents Repentance, nor yet upon their being baptized, and received members of the Church.

Secondly, I deny the subjects to be Believers, when the Apostle told them, *The Promise is unto you, and to your Children*; and its enough for me to deny it, its your work to prove it; yet will I offer somewhat for what I say.

First, *They were pricked at the Heart*, that's all the account is given of them; they were under some Conviction; now Conviction and Conversion are two things, a man may be convinced that is not converted; he must be convinced before he can be converted; *The whole need not the Physician, but they that are sick.*

Secondly, They were ignorant of the way of Salvation, *They cried out, Men and Brethren what shall we do?* and that a Person can't be that does believe; Faith is as well the act of the Understanding as of the Will.

Thirdly, They did not all believe at last, though many other Words were used by way of Exhortation to 'em, to save themselves from that untoward Generation, *verse* 41. *Then they that gladly received the Word were Baptized*; now there is no Argument to be drawn to prove a Priviledge to Believers and their Seed, from what was spoken to Unbelievers.

Secondly, I deny that Interest in the Promise is here intended, and that for these two Reasons. *First*, Such as have an interest in the Promise shall certainly enjoy the good of the Promise; the Heir of the Promise shall inherit in time; it cannot be that the Word of God should have taken none

Effect, *Rom.* 9. The Promise contains Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification. None will aver, that all the Children of Believers shall be saved; and yet they could not miss of it, had they an interest in the Promise.

Secondly, Once an Interest in the Promise, and for ever an interest therein, *Jer.* 32. 40. *I will make an Everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good: and I will put my fear into their Hearts, that they shall not depart from me.*

Thirdly, I deny that barely Interest in the Promise is the ground of Baptism: The Apostle did not lay it down here as the ground of Baptism, but as a Motive to enforce the Exhortation: *Repent and be Baptized*; that's the Exhortation; *For the Promise is to you, and to your Children*, is the Motive. If the Question then be, What must those do to whom the Promise is? The Answer will be this, *Repent and be Baptized:* If it be objected, Repentance was enjoined the Parents only, not the Children, I answer, Baptism also was injoined the Parents not the Children.

Fourthly, I deny the Children were Baptized when their Parents were, *verse* 41. *Then they that gladly received the Word were Baptized*; in which number their Children could not stand.

Secondly, They were not added to the Church, though the number were about three thousand, yet were there no more added than continued in the Apostles Doctrine and Fellowship, and breaking of Bread, and Prayer, which Children were not capable of. No Church-member was ever debarred any one Church-Priviledge, till by their disorderly walking they debarr'd themselves.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

YOU would again argue Childrens Church-membership, from the Jewish Children being received with their Parents by Circumcision.

Reply. The Administration being changed, granted by your self, *page* 17. we must not now take our measures from the old Administration, but from the new; we must see that we have Commission from Christ for what we do.

You say, the Priviledges of Christians are as great under the Gospel, as those of the *Jews* were under the Law.

Reply. I grant their personal Priviledges are as great, and in some respects greater, but then the Question will be, Who are the Christians you intend? *They were the Disciples that were called Christians*, Acts 11. 26. and these Disciples were Believers.

Secondly, You say, if the Children of Believers may be excluded from the Covenant and Church of God, then their Priviledges are less, and their condition worse than those under the Law.

Reply. First, Their Interest in the Covenant of Grace is no otherwise now than it was then, and as for their Church-membership and carnal Ordinances, (as you your self call them) it was the pleasure of God they should enjoy them for a time, and then to repeal them, and to dissolve their Church-state, and our Wills must be resolved into the sovereign Will of God. All things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and that must stop the Mouth of all Objections; then from that time no Man was to be known after the Flesh, then Birth-priviledges

were utterly ceas'd, then a *Jew* which was before born a Member of an instituted Church, could no longer be owned so much as a Member of the universal visible Church, unless in the Judgment of Charity he were new-born: *By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one Body, and made to drink into one Spirit, whether Jew or Gentile.*

Thirdly, They have the Word now as well as then; as soon as they are capable of it, and that much clearer than it was then, and in this respect their Priviledge is greater than of the Children of *Turks* and *Pagans*, (though you say they have no more) and this the Apostle calls the chief Priviledge of the *Jew* above the *Gentile*, Rom. 3. 1, 2. and if by no means their Priviledges must be abated in any one thing, no not in a tittle, then tell me, what you allow them in the room of the Passover, which then they had a right to? *Exod.* 12. 3, 4. *A Lamb for a House:* That Children are a part of the House is your own Argument, therefore they had a right to the Passover.

Thirdly, You say, if the Children of Believers are not Church-members, nor any way in Covenant with God; How then can they be in any state of Salvation? For it is by the Covenant of God in Christ that we are saved.

Reply. I never denied Children to be in the Covenant, as I have clear'd it already: That which I deny is, that the Children of Believers are in the Covenant, considered as such; God knows what Children are in the Covenant, whether of Believers or Unbelievers, I cannot tell; sure I am, that all the Elect are in the Covenant, and they do not all come out of the Loins of Believers.

Fourthly, You say, there is good ground to hope, that the Children of Believers shall be saved;

For

For of such is the Kingdom of God, Mark 10. 14.

Reply. First, If you have such good ground of their Salvation, why do you not commit them to the Dust in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life, when they dye unbaptized?

Secondly, Christ speaks not here of the Children of Believers, but of Children, considered as such.

Thirdly, Christ does not say, that all such are saved, but *of such is the Kingdom of God.* I believe, that Children are capable of Salvation as well as grown Persons, and that such of them as are saved, are saved by vertue of the Covenant of Grace; but how many, and whose Children are saved, neither you, nor I can tell; its a secret lockt up in the Breast of the Almighty, it belongs not to us to enquire; but your Inference from this, that all the Children of Believers have an Interest in the Covenant, and have a right to Baptism, is a meer groundless Conclusion.

Fifthly, You say, I think you contradict your self in saying, if Infants have an Interest in the Covenant, they have a right to Baptism, when before you contended for their entrance in by Baptism; to this you say, the right they have to Baptism is by Interest in the Covenant, and unless they have an Interest in the Covenant, and be reputed Church-members, they ought not to be Baptized.

Reply. If they were in the Covenant before, then they are not entered in by Baptism: If they be entered in by Baptism, then they were not in before.

Sixthly, You say, I grant, that the Children of the *Jews* had an Interest in the Covenant before they were Circumcised.

Reply. That's true, I did grant it, but it's as true, that I denied, that they were entered in by Circumcision. I told you, the Female had an Interest in the Covenant as well as the Male, though they were never Circumcised.

Seventhly, You say, that your calling Baptism the Seal of the Covenant, you think the Nature of the Ordinance does afford ground for it.

Reply. I know no external Seal belonging to the Covenant of Grace, by which a Person may be known to have an Interest therein; nor do you well to call it so without Scripture-ground. I fear, that attributing so much to Baptism as some do, hath a great tendency to make Persons secure.

SECT. VII.

YOu say, at last I take upon me the place of an Opponent, which is contrary to the rules of Disputation, and offer something against Infant-Baptism.

Reply. I never pretended to much skill in the rules of Disputation, nor do I yet: I know not but some of them may be broken now. If I keep within the bounds of Truth and Moderation, it's as much as I look for.

Secondly, You say, that men are bound to pray, and worship God, and perform Duties of Holiness and Righteousness; but Children that are not capable of performing these, are not guilty of any actual Sin in omitting of them.

Reply. Are not Children capable to worship God? why then must they be baptized? is not Baptism, that is so much contended for, a part of Gods worship? *Secondly*, Men are bound to repent, and

and be baptized, but Children that are not capable of the performance of these Duties, are not guilty of actual Sin in the Omission of them.

Thirdly, You say, that all those Scriptures that require Faith and Repentance before Baptism, are to be restrained to those that are made Disciples first at Age; but Infants of Believers have a right, by vertue of the Gospel-Covenant, before they can repent and believe.

Reply. Here again you offer no proof to what you bring, and that is still expected by me, and a bare denial is all that I shall return, till proof be offered.

Fourthly, You say, that Children are capable of entring into Covenant with God, though at present they know not what Baptism means, or what they are engaged to. In *Moses*'s time the little ones entered into Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 11, 12.

Reply. I do not dispute their Capacity, but the Authority of it: Shew me as good Authority for it as *Moses* did, *Deut.* 29. 1. *These are the words of the Covenant, that the Lord commanded me to make with the Children of Israel:* Do but shew me where the Lord hath commanded it, and I will give you the cause.

Fifthly, You say, the first Objection that I offer against Infant-Baptism is this, that if those that are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only subjects of Baptism, according to Christs Commission, then Infants are not: But such as are discipled to Christ by the Word, are the only subjects of Baptism according to Christs Commission, therefore Infants are not.

Your answer to this is, that if by those that are discipled to Christ by the Word are meant such as are discipled by actual Instruction, then you

you deny the Minor: Yon ſay, that Chriſt commanded, that thoſe that be diſcipled to Chriſt by teaching, or otherwiſe, ſhould be baptized.

Reply. Firſt, I wonder, that you have ſo ſoon forgotten what you granted, *Page* 17. You declared, that you did acknowledge, that the chief Commiſſion that the Apoſtles had from Chriſt, was to make Diſciples by Inſtruction, and then to Baptize them, and now it's quite another thing with you.

Secondly, I deny, that there is any other way of diſcipling to Chriſt by the Word, but by actual teaching: Produce an inſtance if you can, of any one that ever was diſcipled to Chriſt by the Word, without actual teaching.

Thirdly, I deny, that Chriſt hath commanded to baptize any more than are diſcipled by Inſtruction or Teaching. The Commiſſion is, *Go and teach all Nations, baptizing them:* See whether you can find one more in the Text to be Baptized by them than were taught: The Word *them* is relative to all Nations taught and diſcipled. *Eraſmus* in his Paraphraſe upon the New Teſtament reads the Commiſſion thus, *Go and teach all Nations*, and when they have learned, *dip them:* I deſire to know, how Miniſters can Diſciple to Chriſt by the Word, otherwiſe than by actual Inſtruction; it was by preaching the Goſpel that they were to Diſciple, ſo *Mark* has it, *Go preach the Goſpel to every Creature:* Men cannot preach the Goſpel without actual Inſtruction: He that is called a Diſciple, *Mat.* 28. is called a Believer, *Mark* 16. 16. and if Faith cometh by hearing, as the Apoſtle tells us, *Rom.* 10. this can't be without actual Inſtruction. I conclude then, that to baptize ſuch as are diſcipled to Chriſt, either by teaching or other-

otherwiſe, is not in the Commiſſion; the word otherwiſe is not in the Tranſlation, nor in the *Greek*, but is an Addition of your own.

Sixthly, You ſay, the Children of Believers are Diſciples of Chriſt, though they are not capable of Learning.

Reply. You had as good ſay, they have learned Chriſt, though they are not capable of Learning.

You ſay, Diſciples may be taken two ways, either for ſuch as are made Diſciples by teaching, or for ſuch as are in a ſtate of Diſciples; you ſay, the Infants of Believers are born Diſciples, by vertue of the Goſpel-Covenant, and that Chriſt himſelf would have the Infants of Believers received in his Name, and accounts the receiving of them the receiving of him, *Mark* 9.37. *Luke* 9.48.

Reply. *Firſt*, There is no mention whether this was the Child of a Believer or not; that there were many of the *Jews* that did not believe, is beyond diſpute, *John* 10. *Ye believe not, becauſe ye are not my ſheep*, ſaith Chriſt; and whether this was the Child of a Believer or not, you do not know.

Secondly, You ſhould have compared it with *Mat*. 18. by which, as the Addition to *Pool*'s *Annotations* obſerves, *Mark* and *Luke* muſt be expounded, and then you might have ſeen, that it was not a little Child, conſidered as ſuch, nor yet as conſidered the Child of a Believer, but a Diſciple of Chriſt that hath humbled himſelf, and is become as a little Child, *Mat*. 18.5. *Whoſoever ſhall offend one ſuch child that believes on me*. Where three Evangeliſts do ſpeak of the ſame thing, as here they do, its good to examine all, and take the ſence from him that ſpeaketh moſt large and clear.

Seventhly,

Seventhly, You say that *Peter* doth in effect call Infants Disciples, *Acts* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples:* The yoke that the false Apostles would have put on their neck was Circumcision, as engaging them to keep the law; this was circumcision after the manner of *Moses*, and then Children being the subjects thereof, must needs be included under the name of Disciples.

Reply. There is not one Word of Children in this whole Controversie, *verse* 1. *They taught the Brethren, that they must be circumcised after the manner of Moses:* The Brethren are the Subjects the manner of *Moses* respects, the form the cutting off the fore-skin; the Brethren are the Subjects that were thus to be circumcised, among which Children of eight days old could not be numbred. For,

First, They were such as had received the Holy Ghost, *v.* 8. *Secondly*, They had purified their hearts by Faith. *Thirdly*, They were such that from among the *Gentiles* were turned unto God, *v.* 19.

Secondly, It was not circumcision barely considered, but circumcision together with the false Doctrine that was this intollerable yoke; for circumcision barely considered was born by Children of eight days old, but circumcision in point of justification, as here it was urged, was a yoke that neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear; now though circumcision might have been imposed on Children of eight days old, yet the false Doctrine could not.

Thirdly, To expound this of Children, is to expound it contrary to the sence of the word disciple, as you well know, and contrary to *Luke* 14. *Except*

cept a man hate Father and Mother, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple.

Eighthly, You say, if Chidren of Believers are holy in such a sence, as to have right by the Covenant of Grace to be admitted members of the visible Church, then they must needs be disciples of Christ; but they are so, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy*; that is, fœderally holy.

Reply. I deny both the *Major* and the *Minor*.

First, I deny the Holiness to be fœderal; there was a case sent to the Apostle for resolution, whether it was lawful for the believing Husband or Wife to continue with his or her unbelieving Yokefellow? which he answers in the affirmative; but how doth he clear it? *First*, He proves the lawfulness of their continuance from the lawfulness of their state; *The unbelieving husband is sanctified in or to the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in or to the husband*; they were sanctified each to other by the ordinance of God, when both were Unbelievers, according to that Text, *Marriage is honourable among all, and the Bed undefiled:* This he illustrates by an instance of the lawfulness of their product, *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.*

Secondly, The holiness of the Child does not arise from the faith of the believing Parent, but from the sanctification of the unbeliever, and none does call that sanctification fœderal holiness; now such as the fountain is, such are the streams, the effect is not greater than the cause.

Thirdly, He speaks of their Children indefinitely, as well those that were born when both were unbelievers, as those that were born after one Parent believed, some of which might remain profes'd

fesſ'd *Pagans* as well as one of the Parents, and yet holy.

Secondly, I deny that all who were fœderally holy were Diſciples of Chriſt, *John* 4. 1. Chriſt and *John* made Diſciples among the *Jews* of thoſe who were fœderally holy, antecedent thereunto: *We are Moſes Diſciples*, ſay ſome, *as for that fellow, we know not whence he is*; and yet they were fœderally holy, *John* 9. 28, 29. and many inſtances more might be given, if need were, to prove that perſons might be fœderally holy, and yet not the Diſciples of Chriſt.

SECT. VIII.

YOU ſay, my ſecond Objection is this, if the Apoſtles, who well underſtood their Lords Commiſſion, did firſt diſciple before they baptized, then are Diſciples the only Subjects of baptiſm; but they did ſo, *Acts* 2. 41. Your Anſwer to this is, that the chief buſineſs of the Apoſtles at the firſt planting of Churches, was to make Diſciples by inſtruction, and then to baptize them; and this ſeems to be one cauſe why they have ſaid little or nothing about baptizing of Children.

Reply. Till you can ſhew me that they had other buſineſs, I ſhall take it for granted that this was their only buſineſs, firſt to diſciple by inſtruction, and then to baptize, and that was the reaſon why they ſaid nothing about the baptizing of Children (as you here confeſs) becauſe it was no part of their buſineſs; and if the Apoſtles ſaid nothing about baptizing of Children, I take that to be the reaſon, why you and others that have written about it, have had no more to ſay to the purpoſe than you have.

Secondly,

Secondly, You say, a second Reason seems to be this, that at that time there was no doubt made, but that Infants ought to be received with their believing Parents, into the visible Church.

Reply. How doth it appear, that there was no doubt made? you do not affirm it your self, and if you did, you could not prove it; yet, I suppose that there was no doubt in the case, it was clear that there was no such thing, there being neither precept no president for it, there could be no such thing of Divine Appointment,

Thirdly, You say, that though there be no such thing in expres terms recorded, yet it can't be concluded from thence, that they baptized none. A negative argument is not valid in matter of fact.

Reply. Though it may not be concluded meerly for want of a President, yet there being neither precept nor president, it may be concluded; for without a precept for it, the Apostles would not do it, and had there been a precept, I doubt not but there would have been presidents enough.

Fourthly, You say, that Christ did many things not recorded in Scripture, *John* 20. and so did the Apostles.

No record in Scripture by Christ or his Apostles of Infant-Baptism, therefore it must be supposed they spake it but did not practice it.

Reply. What is not recorded, is no rule for us to go by.

You say, its very probable that the baptizing of Infants was one of them.

Reply. Probabilities prove nothing, only you do by this seem to intimate that you have nothing in Scripture for it, nor do you know whether to go to fetch any thing.

You say, that the practise of the baptizing of Infants

fants was so early in the Church, that it can hardly be known when it began.

Reply. If it can't be known when it began, then it can't be proved by Scripture; if it could, it would be known when it began. *Secondly*, If it was not from the beginning, then it was not of divine institution, no, though it was in the next age after the Apostles were deceased. *Thirdly*, So early as it was, you can't conclude it more early than can be known, and I have understood that it can't be proved to be in use the first two hundred years after Christ, and that's more to me than the the other fourteen hundred wherein it has been in use.

Fifthly, You say, that *Origen* and *Austin* reports an Apostolical Tradition for it.

Reply. I suppose you do not lay much stress upon unwritten Traditions: For, *First*, You know if we own them, we deny the Scriptures to be a perfect rule: And, *Secondly*, If we receive one, by the same rule we may receive more, and when shall we know when we have recieved all: I suppose there are plenty of them in the same shop out of which this came. *Thirdly*, It's a sign you have not Scripture to prove it, in that you run to unwritten Traditions, if you had ground for it in Scripture, there were no need to fly to them.

Sixthly, You say, there are some probable grounds in Scripture, that the Apostles upon the Parents faith baptized their Children; when the Goaler was converted, it's expresly said, *That he and all his were straightway baptized*, Acts 16.33. and it's probable some of these were Infants.

Reply. It's not only more probable that here were no Infants, but it's certain there were none: For, *First*, It's said, *They spake to him the word of the Lord*,

Lord, and to all that were in his house, ver. 32. that was before they were baptized. *Secondly*, *He believed in God with all his house*, ver, 34.

You say, it's probable there were some Infants baptized, in that there were whole Houſholds, and Infants are part of a Houſhold.

Reply. It's more probable that Infants were not baptized, from the inſtances that are given of theſe four houſholds, then if there had been no inſtance given of them: For, *Firſt*, Had it been the practice of the Apoſtles, to baptize the whole family upon the profeſſion of the Head of the Family, I see no reaſon why theſe families ſhould be mentioned more than others. *Secondly*, The Goalers family are proved already to be all believers. The second is *Criſpus*, *Acts* 18. 8. *Then Criſpus, the chief ruler of the ſynagogue, believed in God with all his houſe, and many of the Corinthians believed, and were baptized*: If whole families beleive, then whole families are baptized; if but a part believe, then but a part is baptized. The third is the houſhold of *Stephanus*, and they are ſaid to be the firſt fruits of *Achaia*, and to have addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints, 1 *Cor.* 16. 19. The fourth Houſhold is *Lydia*, and no body knows whether ſhe was Maid, Wife or Widdow.

Seventhly, You ſay, if Children had been denied Church-Memberſhip, doubtleſs thoſe *Jews* that were converted to Chriſtianity at firſt would have raiſed a ſtorm about it, as they did about leſſer matters.

Reply. Your doubtleſs proves no more than your probabilities did, and therefore I ſhall return no Anſwer to it at preſent.

Eighthly, You ſay, there is no expreſs prohibition, forbidding us to recieve infants into the Church by baptiſm.

Reply.

Reply. There is no need of a prohibition, becauſe it was never of Divine Appointment.

Ninthly, You ſay, there is more need of an expreſs prohibition, forbidding infants to be admitted into the Church by Baptiſm, than there is of an expreſs Command or Example for the admitting of them, becauſe, before Chriſt's coming they always enjoyed the priviledge of being enter'd into the Church, and if this ancient priviledge be taken away, where is there any plain precept or preſident for it.

Reply. Firſt, You have granted a repeal of that ancient priviledge already, that the old or legal adminiſtration is done away, that there is a new adminiſtration eſtabliſhed by. Chriſt, that the *Jews* ſtood as aliens as well as others.

Secondly, You have not proved, that Children ſtood Church-Members under the new adminiſtration, and therefore it's in vain to call for a Repeal.

Tenthly, You ſay, that one or both of theſe is neceſſary to warrant us to deny Infants-Baptiſm.

Reply. One or both of theſe is neceſſary to warrant to baptize them, leſt God ſhould ſay, who hath required this at your hands, but there is no need of either to warrant us to deny them baptiſm, for where there is no law there is no tranſgreſſion.

Eleventhly, You ſay, for a concluſion, it can never be proved that Chriſt or his Apoſtles hath expreſly forbidden Infants to be admitted into his Church by baptiſm, therefore they may and ought to be baptized.

Reply. Firſt, I perceive you are almoſt out of breath, in that you have but a negative argument left for your practice.

Secondly, It can never be proved, that God did expreſly forbid *Nadab* and *Abihu* to offer incenſe with

with ſtrange fire, and yet they were deſtroyed by fire from Heaven, for doing it with fire that he commanded them not.

Thirdly, It's none of our buſineſs to enquire after Prohibitons in matters of worſhip, that which we are to enquire after is, whether it be of Divine Inſtitution, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Teaching them to obſerve all things, whatſoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you always, even unto the end of World:* If we expect the preſence and bleſſing of God with us, and on us, in what we do, we muſt be ſure to keep cloſe to his commands: *Thou meeteſt him that rejoyceth and worketh righteouſneſs, that remembreth thee in thy ways*, Iſa. 64. 5. God's ways are the ways of his Commands, *Pſal.* 119. 1, 2, 3.

Fourthly, That which is not commanded in matters of worſhip is forbidden: Under the Old Teſtament it was not expreſly forbidden, *Deut.* 12. 32. *Whatſoever thing I command you, that obſerve and do, thou ſhalt not add thereto, nor diminiſh from it:* And we may not ſuppoſe, that Chriſt has left his Worſhip more imperfect, or his people more at liberty under the Goſpel. *Moſes* was faithful in God's houſe as a Servant, but Chriſt as a Son, *Heb.* 3. 2. under the New Teſtament diſpenſation, that which is not commanded in matters of worſhip, is forbidden implicitly and conſequentially, *Joh.* 4. 24. *God is a Spirit, and they that worſhip him, muſt worſhip him in ſpirit and in truth:* That God that doth expreſly require men to worſhip him in truth, doth implicitly forbid all falſe ways of Worſhip, that are not ruled by the Word of Truth.

Fifthly, If that which Chriſt hath not expreſly forbidden may be admitted into the worſhip of God, then may all the burthenſom Ceremonies imaginable be admitted in.

I come now to reply to your third Paper, which you entitled, *The vindication of Infant-Baptism vindicated.*

In your first *Section* you say, I charge you with misrepresenting my words; in saying, I granted that such as ought to be admitted Members of the visible Church have a right to baptism, when I granted it only with respect of an instituted Church: But seeing my Words were doubtful, (you say) you took them, as you concieved, in the best sence.

Reply. First, I have not abused you in this, but have stated it as it was.

Secondly, My Words were plain; I said, if by the visible Church you meant an instituted Church, I granted it.

Your Answer is this, that Baptism is more likely to be the means of admitting Members into the universal visible Church, than into a particular Congregational Church; for if a Man were admitted into a particular Congregation by baptism, then when he left that, and is admitted into another, he must be baptized again.

Reply. Here you grant my Argument, (though under another term) that Baptism could not be the formal, constituting cause, because it could be but once administred, and there may be cases in which a person may be twice formed a Member: I instanced in a person justly ejected, and afterwards repenting; you instance in a persons removing from one Church to another, which is the same thing in effect; and this is the Church I intended, when I said an instituted Church: I told you in my last, I knew no formal way of admission into the universal visible Church, unless you call the preaching of the Word the formal way. A Person called out

out of the World by the preaching of the Word, is upon his embracing of Christ to be owned a Member of the universal visible Church.

Secondly, You say, there is a great deal of difference between constituting a Man a Member of the Church, and receiving of one that was a Member before; a Man must be a real Member of the Church, before he can be solemnly received by baptism, and declared a visible Member.

Reply. If I do rightly understand this, here is a grant, that those that you baptize are not Members of the Visible Church, antecedent thereunto, and I think I am not mistaken, for in *page 67.* you say, that Children are invisibly, and before God interested in the Covenant, and Church-members before they are baptized: Now pray tell me how you know, that such as you baptize were really Members of the visible Church; if they were not visibly such, we cannot judge but by visibility.

Thirdly, You say, that Baptism is a means to admit persons into the visible Church, and as you take it, the Scripture is on your side in it, for which you bring three Scriptures, *Rom. 6. 3. As many of you as were baptized into Christ.*

Reply. This speaks not of baptizing into the Church, but into Christ; and these that are here said to be baptized into Christ, were not only real, but visible Members of the universal visible Church, antecedent thereunto; they were Believers, they had made a verbal profession of their Faith, which was enough to declare them Members of the universal visible Church, before they were baptized.

Your Second Text is, *Acts 2. 41. Then they that gladly received the Word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand Souls.*

Reply. First, They were members of the universal visible Church before they were baptized, their professed Reception of the Word declared them such. —— *Secondly*, Their being added, was to a particular instituted Church, or a Congregational Church, where the Supper of the Lord was to be enjoyed. You grant your self, that Baptism does not form a Person a member of an instituted Church; for if it did, a Person must be as oft baptized as he is received.

Your third Text is, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. *By one Spirit are ye all baptized into one Body*, &c.

Reply. I confess this is the universal visible Church, but here I have two things to Object: *First*, These were not members before. *Secondly*, This is not Water-baptism, but Spiritual baptism, or Regeneration, so that neither of these Scriptures do prove what they are brought for.

Fourthly, You say, that a Person justly excommunicated is not wholly unchurched, but only excluded from the outward Communion till he repent. Against this you say, I object, that an excommunicated Person is cut off from that particular Body whereof he once stood a member. The Scripture that I brought to prove this, it seems does not satisfie you; that in *Matthew* you say declares a Person to be in the same circumstances as a Heathen-man, in regard of outward Communion, but this is your own distinction, there is no such thing in the Text; the charge is, *Let him be to thee as a Heathen-man or a Publican*, and such a one is no member of that particular Body; and as for that in 1 *Cor.* 5. They are bid to *put away from among themselves that wicked Person:* How he should be put away from amongst them, and yet continued a member with them, I do not know.

Fifth-

Fifthly, You Object, that a man excommunicated may retain the Profeſſion of his Faith, and be heartily grieved for his Sins, which ſtrongly argues him a member of the univerſal viſible Church.

Reply. Firſt, If he be truly humbled and grieved for his Sins, he ought not to be excommunicated; therefore want of this is neceſſarily ſuppoſed, when a Perſon is juſtly ejected.

Secondly, If Grief and Humiliation do appear after he is ejected, it argues him a member of the univerſal Church, I grant; but not a member of that particular Body out of which he was caſt, as they are conſidered an inſtituted Church.

Sixthly, You ſay, the Apoſtle writes to them to forgive him, and comfort him, that is, to abſolve him from the puniſhment, which ſtrongly argues he was not received in as an Alien.

Reply. The Queſtion is not, after what manner he was to be received? but whether he was caſt out, and that you do not deny; now to be caſt out from among them, and at the ſame time be continued a member with them, are terms inconſiſtent; and if he were formally caſt out, as it appears he was, he muſt be formally received again, before he could be owned a member of that particular Congregation.

SECT. II.

YOu ſay, I blame you for not taking notice of the excluding of Baſtards under the legal Adminiſtration, which ſeems to contradict your preſent practiſe in receiving them. You ſay, you made no Anſwer, becauſe you thought it impertinent to the true ſenſe of the Text, which is *Deut.* 23. 2. where a Baſtard is forbid to *enter into the*

Congregation of the Lord to the tenth Generation. The Criticks (say you) expound it thus, that a Bastard was not to bear Office in the Church to the tenth Generation.

Reply. First, You had done well, if you had told me, who those Criticks are that give this Critical Exposition. *Pool* in his *Synopsis*, whose work it was to collect them, mentions no such thing, as I am informed.

Secondly, I know not how the Criticks do expound the Words, I know the Text is plain, and a Text may be wier-drawn in the Exposition of it, beyond what the sense will afford: Nor do I see what ground there is either from the coherence of this or any other Text thus to expound it.

Thirdly, I cannot yet accept of that Critical Interpretation, and that for these Reasons:

First, I do not find that the Females were admitted into ordinary Offices at all under that dispensation, (and of such I suppose you intend it) but a Bastard might be Female as well as Male.

Secondly, God chose the Tribe of *Levi* to officiate in that Church-state, but a Bastard might be of any other Tribe as well as of that.

Secondly, You offer one Argument to prove, that the Text did not intend an Exclusion from the means of Salvation; for God hath declared, *That the Son shall not bear the Iniquity of the Father*, *Ezek.* 18. 20. and never did God punish the Children with spiritual Punishment, as sometimes he doth with Temporal, for the Fathers fault.

Reply. First, Your Quotation is Impertinent, for that respects a temporal Punishment, their being in *Babylon*, which they thought was a stroke laid upon them meerly for their Fathers fault.

Secondly, Your assertion will not hold good, God

God threatned that the Man-child that was not Circumcised the eighth day, should *be cut off from the Congregation of his People*; and yet the fault lay not in the Child, but in the Parent, *Gen.* 17. 14.

SECT. III.

YOu say, I own the Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 7. to be the Covenant of Grace; but that I deny the Covenant *Gen.* 17. 8. and so to 15. to be the Covenant of Grace, and that because it was made with the natural Seed, considered as such, and contained temporal Blessings only; and that I would have all this granted to me without proof.

Reply. I offered proof to what I asserted, but if you take no notice of it, the fault is yours, and not mine. As for the Seed mentioned in the eighth *verse*, its granted that they were the natural Seed, that needs no proof, and for the spiritual Seed I quoted the fourth verse of the same Chapter; *As for me, my Covenant shall be with thee, and a Father of many Nations will I make thee; and thy Name shall no more be called Abram, but Abraham shall thy Name be, for a Father of many Nations have I made thee*: These are the spiritual Seed, as appears *Rom.* 4. and this is the same Covenant with that in the 7. *verse*, as appears in that the Lord hath made himself over to *Abraham*, and to his Seed absolutely, and so he hath not to any but the spiritual Seed, or the mystical Seed, which is that I intend.

Secondly, You say, here is but one Covenant mentioned, *Gen.* 17.

Reply. First, Here is a Covenant mentioned in which the Land of *Canaan* was not put as the Inheritance, *verse* 4, 5. the *Gentiles* had no Title thereunto, and they are the many Nations there intended.

Secondly, Here is a Covenant, in which the Land of *Canaan* was put as the Inheritance, *verſe* 8, 9. therefore there are two Covenants mentioned.

Thirdly, The Lord makes himſelf over abſolutely with reſpect to the ſpiritual Seed, *verſe* 7. and he makes himſelf over conditionally with reſpect to the natural Seed, *verſe* 8, 9. which is ſufficient to prove that there are two Covenants mentioned.

Thirdly, You ſay, there is a ſpiritual Promiſe expreſt in the 8*th*. *verſe*, in the ſame words as in the 7*th*. *And I will be their God*; which confutes my Interpretation, and defeats my Deſign.

Reply. *Firſt*, I deſire you to ſtay a little, I have not yet replied to it. *Secondly*, The Promiſe is not in the ſame words, there is ſome variation in them. *Thirdly*, It is not in the ſame Senſe, now if it be worded never ſo much alike its nothing, if it differ in the ſence; in the 7*th*. *verſe* it's abſolute, in the 8*th*. there is a Condition annexed, *You ſhall keep my Covenant*; a failure in the performance of which Condition was a breach of the Covenant, *verſe* 14.

Thirdly, It confutes not my Interpretation, for when I ſaid, the Covenant of Grace contained ſpiritual Bleſſings, this temporal only, I explained my meaning, that God never promiſed a new Heart and a new Spirit, by vertue of that Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, conſidered as ſuch; for which I brought *Deut*. 28. where you have a Catalogue of the Bleſſings of that Covenant, but the Covenant of Grace contains ſpiritual Bleſſings, *Jer*. 31. 33, 34. *That God will write his Law in their Hearts, that they ſhall all know him, that he will forgive their Sins.*

Fourthly, It defeats not my Deſign, though the Lord

Lord promiſed to be their God; you have here found nothing that is new to me, nor more than I offered you in my laſt; wherein I ſhewed you the vaſt difference between the Lords making himſelf over to the ſpiritual Seed, by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, and his making himſelf over to the natural ſeed, by vertue of this Covenant.

Firſt, In that the Promiſes of the Covenant of Grace were better Promiſes, *Heb.* 8. 6. better in that they contained ſpiritual Bleſſings, Juſtification, Sanctification, and Glorification; but the Promiſes of this Covenant contained temporal Bleſſings only, and theſe for the moſt part hung on Conditions too. Now according as the Tenor of the Covenant is, by which God makes himſelf over unto a People, ſuch is the Priviledge of the People that have an Intereſt in him, by vertue of the Covenant of Grace; he was their God to bleſs them with Grace here, and to crown them with Glory hereafter. You ſay your ſelf, *Book* 2. *Page* 3. That God promiſed *Abraham*, Gen. 17. 7. *That he would be a God to him, and to his Seed after him*; implying, that he would afford to them that were in Covenant with him, all bleſſings that could be expected from a gracious God; and what can be expected leſs than Grace here, and Glory hereafter? But I never found that God did afford all theſe Bleſſings, or any of them, to the natural Seed, conſidered as ſuch; but for God to be their God, by vertue of that Covenant into which they were taken, was but to give them thoſe outward Bleſſings that were put into that Covenant, as the Land of *Canaan*, and a flouriſhing Eſtate in that Land, and moſt of theſe hung on Condition of their Obedience too; who could expect more from God by vertue of that Covenant, than what the Lord put into it?

Second.

Secondly, Intereſt in God by vertue of the Covenant of Grace cannot be loſt, *Pſal.* 48. 14. *This God is our God*, even our own God, *for ever and ever, he will be our guide to Death*, Jer. 32. 40. but intereſt in God by vertue of this Covenant might be loſt, *Hoſ.* 1. *Call his name Loammi, for ye are not my People, neither will I be your God.* Ten Tribes cut off at once. So though God be an eternal God, yet was their Relation to him by vertue of this Covenant but Temporal, and in this reſpect it may well be ſaid, that this Covenant contained Temporal Bleſſings only. I cannot yet ſee, that my Interpretation is confuted, or my deſign defeated.

Fourthly, You ſay, that though there be nothing in *Gen.* 17. to demonſtrate that the Covenant of Grace was made with *Abraham* and his ſpiritual Seed, yet I think I have an unanſwerable one, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promiſe.* Your Anſwer to this is, that the Apoſtle doth not here mention all that are in Covenant with God, in regard of external Priviledges, but only deſcribes the ſpiritual Seed of *Abraham* in regard of ſaving Grace.

Reply. Firſt, How ſhall I know, that the Apoſtle would have us thus to diſtinguiſh: He only tells us, *That thoſe that are Chriſts are Abrahams ſeed, and Heirs according to Promiſe.* I would now Query; *Firſt*, Whether ſome of the Subjects of the new Covenant have a right to ſaving Grace, and not all? God promiſed it to all, *Jer.* 31. 33. without excepting any; *I will write my Law in their Hearts, and they ſhall all know me, from the leaſt to the greateſt.* You ſay your ſelf, *page* 14. that God will not fail to do us good, and to afford us Grace ſuffi-

ſufficient to enable us to keep his Covenant; and I ſuppoſe, by this you mean all the ſubjects of this Covenant, or elſe you do nothing, and is not this ſaving Grace? I know no difference between Grace to enable us to perſevere, and ſaving Grace. *Secondly*, I would Query, Whether the Covenant of Grace be made with any but *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gal.* 3. 16. *Now to Abraham and his Seed were the Promiſes made; he ſaith not, of Seeds, as of many, but unto thy Seed, as of one, which is Chriſt.* Give me but one Scripture that extends the Promiſes beyond the Seed of *Abraham*. *Thirdly*, Whether *Abraham* had any other Seed among the *Gentiles* to whom this was ſpoken, but the ſpiritual Seed? *Abraham* had but two Seeds, a natural and a ſpiritual; the *Gentiles* are not his natural Seed, they muſt be his ſpiritual, or not at all.

Fourthly, Whether there be any more of the *Gentiles* that are his ſpiritual Seed than thoſe that are Chriſt's? And *Fifthly*, Whether thoſe that are Chriſt's can be known by us to be the Seed of *Abraham*, till they walk in the ſteps of *Abraham*'s Faith? The ſubſtance of theſe things I offered you twice before, but as yet have not obtained one Anſwer.

Fifthly, You ſay, that none but true Believers and ſound Members of Chriſt are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, and none but ſuch ſhall receive remiſſion of Sins and Eternal Life.

Reply. *Firſt*, If none but true Believers are the ſpiritual ſeed of *Abraham*, then none but true Believers are the ſubjects of the Covenant of Grace: *To Abraham, and to his Seed, were the promiſes made, he ſaith not of ſeeds*, &c. Why then do you labour to bring in ſuch to be the ſubjects of this Covenant

nant that are not the ſpiritual ſeed ? The *Gentiles* are not his natural ſeed, nor can they be *made partakers of the promiſe, but in Chriſt*, Epheſ. 3. 6.

Secondly, I deny that none but true Believers are the ſeed of *Abraham*; the Text ſaith, *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye Abraham's ſeed:* Now if I prove them to be Chriſt's, antecedent unto Faith, I prove them to be *Abraham*'s ſeed, antecedent unto Faith; for the proof of this take two Scriptures, *John* 17. 23. *That he may give eternal life to as many as thou haſt given unto me, and this is life eternal to know thee to be the only true God, and Jeſus Chriſt whom thou haſt ſent:* This is faith, as its conſidered the act of the underſtanding, but theſe were given unto Chriſt, before Eternal Life was given unto them by Chriſt; and if they were given to him, they were Chriſts, *Pſal.* 110. *Thy people ſhall be willing in the day of thy Power:* Thy People before they were a willing people, and if they were his People before they were a willing people, they were his People before they did believe; and if they were Chriſts before they did believe, then were they *Abraham*'s ſeed before they did believe; ſuch as were given him by Covenant, *Rom.* 4. *A father of many Nations have I made thee*; ſpeaking of thoſe things that are not, as if they were. If *Abraham* was their Father, then were they his Children; tho' they are not ſo in our Eye, yet they are ſo in God's Eye.

You ſay, that none but thoſe that do believe ſhall receive remiſſion of ſin, and inherit eternal life.

Reply. It's true, if you reſpect grown perſons; and it is as true, that ſuch who in time believe, had their ſins pardoned, and a title to eternal life antecedent thereunto; but I ſhall find another place to handle this.

Sixthly,

Sixthly, You say, tho' none but Believers do inherit Eternal Life, yet there are many Gospel-Priviledges which come on those that embrace and profess the Gospel; they have many offers of Grace, and Promises of Pardon made to them, on condition of Repentance and new Obedience, which clearly shews, that they are subjects of the Gospel-Covenant, in respect of External Priviledges.

Reply. First, I would know what you mean by embracing the Gospel? whether it be heartily or feignedly? if it be heartily, then they have not only external Priviledges, but internal also; if it be but feignedly, then they have no more priviledge than others have to whom the Gospel comes, that never do embrace it; they have the tender of the promise of Pardon and Salvation as well as these; the *Jews*, that contradicted and blasphemed, *Acts* 13. had the offer as well as others; those that did not receive the Word, *Acts* 2. had the offer as well as those that did, the Pagans or Heathens had the offer, wherever the Apostles preached to them.

Secondly, The Offer is free; *Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*, Mark 16. 15. Christ freely offers himself in the Word; *The Spirit and the Bride say come, and let him that is athirst come, and whosoever will, let him come and drink of the water of life freely:* Sinners, as Sinners, are invited; *Such as have no money, are bid to come without money and without price*, Isa. 55. 2. *Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the Earth.* The reason why Men go without it, is, because they will not accept of that which is freely offered; there is no prequalification required in any to the accepting of Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, The Offer of Grace does not at all argue

argue persons to be the Subjects of the Covenant, for then those *Jews* that had the offer, and rejected it, Pagans and Heathens also, to whom this Gospel was preached, were the Subjects of the Covenant, and this is contrary to your own principle. You say your self, that the *Jews* were Aliens as well as others, and were not subjects of the Covenant, till they were converted, and yet they had the offer before.

Seventhly, You say, if many of those that are externally in Covenant, do not obtain the special benefits and promises of the Covenant, the reason is, because they do not perform the conditions thereof. The Promise is firm on Gods part, he will not fail to perform what he hath promised to all true Believers, but it is too possible for man to fail of his duty, and so to come short of the Benefit promised.

Reply. First, I desire to know, whether there be no benefit promised to any but true Believers? whether Faith it self be not a New-Covenant Blessing or Benefit? or whether it be to be found in Natures Garden? this I desired in my last, but could not obtain an answer, at least not in words at length. However, there is this granted me, *page* 31. that the first degree of Grace, by which our Understanding is enlightned, and our Wills renewed, is absolutely promised, and if so, then is faith promised; for the Essence of Faith lieth in the Act of the understanding, and of the will, and when the Lord hath performed this promise, then is a Soul a true Believer; and if the Lord will not fail to perform what he hath promised to all true Believers, then he will not fail to save them, for that is his promise to all true Believers, *Mark* 16. 16. *John* 3. 16. *He that believeth, shall be saved.* Nor is

it

it possible for any of the subjects of this Covenant, to whom God will give the first degree of Grace, by which the Understanding is enlightned, and the Heart and Will reformed, (which you say are absolutely promised) so to fail of their duty, as to come short of the benefit promised, seeing its as absolutely promised, that when *God hath given them a new heart, that he will put his Spirit within them, and cause them to walk in his Statutes, and observe his Judgments.*

SECT. IV.

YOU say, the main thing contended about, is, Whether the Covenant, *Deut.*29. be the Covenant of Grace or no: You say, the very Tenour of the Covenant of Grace is, *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people*, Heb. 8. 10. and the Tenor of the Covenant, *Deut.* 29. is the same, *That I may establish thee a people unto my self, and that I may be to you a God:* And sure the Tenor of the Covenant is the best Evidence to know the nature of the Covenant by.

Reply. First, I deny that the Tenor of the Covenant, *Deut.* 29. is the same with that *Heb.* 8. there is a manifest difference; the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace, *Heb.* 8. is, *I will write my Law in their hearts, and in their minds, and will be their God, and they shall all know me from the least to the greatest, for I will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their sins no more*; but the Tenor of the Covenant in *Deut.* is only this, *That the Lord may establish thee to be a people unto himself, and that he may be to thee a God:* Here is not a Word of *writing his law in their hearts*; not a word, *That they shall all know him, from the least to the greatest*; nor yet

yet, *That he will be merciful to their unrighteousnes, and remember their sins no more.*

Secondly, The Blessings of the Covenant of Grace were never promised to the Natural Seed, as such, nor did they ever enjoy them; yet when God makes himself over to a people by covenant, it is to give out to them, and bestow on them the blessings of that covenant. When the Lord made himself over to the natural seed by covenant, it was to bestow on them the blessings of that covenant, according to the Tenor thereof, a Catalogue of which blessings you have, *Deut.* 28. but not one spiritual blessing among them; it was according to those words *Deut.* 28. that God made a Covenant with them *Deut.* 29. as appears *verse* 1. the note that I gave you, *verse* 25. by which its distinguished from the Covenant of Grace, you have deferred the Answer too till some other place, only you say, if it be such an essential mark of difference, it is to be applied to the ceremonial Law that gave to *Israel* when they came out of *Egypt*.

Reply. The Ceremonial Law was but annext to this covenant, it was distinct from the essence thereof, *Heb.* 9. 1. *Then verily the first Covenant had also Ordinances of Divine Worship*, &c. The Ordinances contained in the Ceremonial Law were but the adjuncts of the first covenant: Now that mark, *Deut.* 29. 25. refers to the covenant it self, and not to the adjuncts thereof.

Secondly, You say, that the very words of the covenant, *Deut.* 29. 13. are declared by the Prophet, *Jeremiah* 7. 22, 23. to distinguish the Covenant of Grace from the Ceremonial Law: *I spake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded I them, in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of Egypt,*

concerning burnt-offerings, but this thing commanded I them, saying, obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people. To this you say I replyed, that there is not one word of the Covenant of Grace in this place.

Reply. I do yet stand to it, nor is there one mark by which the Covenant of Grace may be known; and in that it was spoken to them, or a covenant made with them, in the day that God took them by the hand to lead them out of the Land of *Egypt*, it plainly appears, that it was not the covenant of Grace, for that covenant that he made with them in the day he brought them up out of *Egypt*, is distinguished from the covenant of Grace *Jer.* 31, 32. Barely for God to be the God of a People, tho' by covenant, is not sufficient to demonstrate it to be the covenant of Grace. God was a Husband unto *Israel*, by vertue of the Covenant he made with them, and if their Husband, then he was their God, yet was that Covenant distinct from the Covenant of Grace, *verse* 31, 33. compared.

Secondly, He was their God on condition of Obedience, and that was sufficient to discriminate it from the Covenant of Grace.

Thirdly, You say, there is the substance of that Covenant *Jer.* 31.33. to be found in this, therefore there is ground to conclude that this is the Covenant of Grace: *This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will write my Law in their hearts, and put it in their inward parts, I will be their God, and they shall be my people.*

Reply. First, That covenant *Jer.* 31.33. is absolute, *I will be their God*; that in *Jer.* 7. is conditional, *Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my People.*

Secondly, There is a promise, *Jer.* 31. *That God*

will write his law in their hearts, that they shall all know him, that he will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their sin no more; but there is no such promise *Jer.* 7. therefore the substance of the one is not in the other.

Secondly, You say, that when God is said to do all in the work of our Sanctification, there our endeavours are always supposed.

Reply. First, The principle of Grace must be wrought in us without our own endeavours, granted by your self, *pag.* 31. That by which the understanding is enlightned, and the will renewed, these Blessings (you say) are freely bestowed upon us, not for any work of righteousness that we have done.

Thirdly, Whatever endeavours are put forth by us, they are the fruits of his Grace, *Phil.* 2. 13. *It's God that worketh in you, both to will and to do of his own good pleasure*, Ezek. 36. 27.

Fourthly, Where there are the greatest endeavours put forth by us, future Blessings do not depend on them as means procuring, *Rom.* 9. so then it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.

Thirdly, You say, that where the Scripture seems to lay the whole work of Sanctification on us, and requires us to purifie the heart, as it doth *James* 1. 5. *Ezek.* 15. 31. *Isa.* 1. 17, 18. there the Assistance and Operation of God's Grace is still supposed.

Reply. First, It's one thing to have the assistance of God's Grace supposed, and it's another thing to have it promised: I deny, that God hath promised Grace to enable all to cleanse and purifie the heart; that he requireth so to do, produce a promise if you can.

Secondly,

Secondly, Nothing short of true Faith will enable us to cleanse and purifie the heart, and that's not afforded unto all; all men have not Faith, no, nor all men where the Gospel cometh, *John* 12. 37.

Thirdly, We can't purifie our hearts till God giveth a new heart, and when that is done, he will put his spirit within us, and cause us to walk in his statutes.

Fourthly, You say, we cannot will nor do, without the Grace of God concuring with us.

Reply. This is somewhat obscure; do you mean the grace of God without us, or the principles of grace within us. If you mean the grace of God without us, as I suppose you do, then I would query, whom you intend by the subjects? whether the regenerate or the unregenerate? If you intend the regenerate, it's sound, for we are not sufficient of our selves to think any thing as of our selves, but then it is not pertinent, for God requires sinners as well as Saints to purifie their hearts; if you mean the unregenerate, such whose hearts and wills are not reformed, they can do nothing of what God requires, granted by your self *pag.* 32. *The carnal mind is enmity against God, and is not subject unto the Law of God, neither indeed can be*, Rom. 8: 7.

Fifthly, You say, God will not put his fear in our hearts, make us holy, and preserve us in the way of Salvation without our own consent and endeavour.

Reply. First, God doth never ask our consent when he bestows on us the principles of Grace, they are freely given, granted by your self *page* 31. the promises that God will put his fear into our hearts, *Jer.* 32. 40. that he will write his Law

there, *Jer.* 31. 33. are both absolute; the promise of the Spirit also is absolute, *Ezek.* 36. 27. and whatever endeavours are put forth by us, are the fruits of his Grace, *Phil.* 2. 13.

Secondly, The fear of God once planted in the heart, will so operate in the Soul by the Influence of the Spirit, that the Soul shall not depart from God; it's a great means of perseverence: Where the fear of God is, the Soul dares not to allow it self in sin, it cries out, how shall I do this wickedness and sin against God? and it's a means to put us forward in duty, we are bid *To perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord*, 2 Cor. 7. 1.

Sixthly, You say, *We must work out our Salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God that worketh in us, both to will and to do of his own good pleasure.*

Reply. I grant it; to deny this is to deny the Word, yet our Salvation doth not depend on what we do, as a means procuring, but only follows it as a means preparing.

Seventhly, You say, when God affordeth us sufficient grace to obey the Gospel, it's possible for us, through our own perverse wills, to abuse his Grace, and to depart from him.

Reply. First, Nothing short of a New Heart, in which are all the principles of Grace, is sufficient to make us capable of Gospel-obedience.

Secondly, When that is bestowed on us, yet is not that sufficient to enable us to yield obedience to the Gospel without Divine Assistance, 2 *Cor.* 3. 5.

Thirdly, When God hath given us sufficient grace to obey the Gospel, he will not fail to assist us by his Spirit, so as that the principle shall be exerted

exerted in actual Obedience, *Ezek.* 36. 27.

Fourthly, It seems harsh to me to hear you call a renewed and sanctified will a perverse will, tho' I grant that there is perverseness remaining in it, yet that does not denominate it a perverse will, no more than the remainders of Hypocrisie in a sanctified soul do denominate him an Hypocrite.

Fifthly, It seems more harsh to hear you say, that a Soul may abuse the Grace of God, and depart from him, when God hath said, *He will put his fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from him.*

Eighthly, You say, that if we forsake him, he will forsake us, 2 *Chron.* 15. 2.

Reply. First, It's granted, that interest in God by vertue of that covenant that took in the natural seed, considered as such, might be lost; if they departed from God, he was under no obligation to continue with them.

Secondly, I grant, that where a person doth totally and finally forsake God, God will forsake him; but this proves not that a Gracious Soul may so forsake God; and till you do that, you do nothing. Every *Hypothesis* in Scripture does not suppose a possibility; *If I go up to Heaven, thou art there*; but this supposeth not a possibility of his going up to Heaven.

Ninthly, You say, the Severity and Goodness of God are both on conditions, severity on them that fell and rejected the Gospel, but towards Believers goodness, if they continue in his goodness, otherwise they also shall be cut off, *Rom.* 11. 22.

Reply. This Quotation is impertinent, either those that are here said to be Believers were really such, or they were not; if they were, they could

not fall away, if they were not; their falling away proves not that a gracious soul may so fall; a person may fall from his profession totally and finally, but that a gracious soul may so fall, is denied.

SECT. V.

YOU say, you come again to examine the differences that I make between the Covenant of Grace, and that into which the *Jews* entred with their seed, and to vindicate your Answers to them against my Exceptions. The first Difference you say I made was this, that the Covenant into which the *Jews* entered with their seed was a covenant that might be broken, that it contained curses as well as blessings, *Deut.* 29. 20, 21. that the Covenant of Grace cannot be broken, and that it contains only blessings, and threatens no curse. Here you say I blame you for adding to what I said, that the Covenant of Grace threatned no curse is put in by your self.

Reply. I did not only blame you for adding, but also for diminishing; I told you, that the curses of the first covenant might fall on the subjects thereof, without a sanctified use of them, as they did on the evil figs, *Jer.* 24. this you left out then, and now too.

Secondly, You say, that it seems my Opinion is now altered, and that I do now own that it threatens a curse.

Reply. If it seems so to you, yet it does not to me, for my Opinion is still the same; I gave you no grant of any such thing, I only blamed you for adding to my words: Sure I am, there is no curse threatned in that which you say *page* 30. contains the substance of the Covenant of Grace, there are only

only Bleſſings; *I will take the ſtony heart out of your fleſh, I will be merciful to their unrighteouſneſs, their ſins and iniquities will I remember no more.* This you ſay is the ſubſtance of the Covenant of Grace; nor do I find that there is any curſe threatned, *Gen.* 17. 7. nor *Gen.* 22. 18. nor any where elſe, where the Covenant of Grace is more largely handled.

Thirdly, You ſay, that to prove that the Covenant of Grace can't be broken, I alledge *Jer.* 32. 40. to this you ſay the promiſe is not abſolute.

Reply. That promiſe that requires no condition to be performed, antecedent to the enjoyment of the bleſſings thereof, is abſolute; but this promiſe requires no condition to be performed antecedent to the enjoyment of the bleſſings thereof, therefore it is abſolute.

Secondly, You ſay, the promiſe here hath reſpect to his peoples coworking with his Grace.

Reply. Firſt, This is very obſcure in words; I know not what it is in us that coworks with the Grace of God; there are but two ſprings of motion in a gracious ſoul, a carnal and a ſpiritual, a natural and a ſupernatural, theſe will never co-operate one with another, they being contrary one to the other.

Secondly, If you mean by co-working, the puting forth the acts of Grace, this is the fruit of intereſt in the promiſe, not the condition of perſeverance.

Thirdly, You ſay, that it cannot import that God will ſanctifie his people, and cauſe them to perſevere, without any of their own endeavours.

Reply. Firſt, The promiſe of Grace is abſolute, granted by your ſelf both here and elſewhere;

and if of grace, then of ſanctification, for it's the ſame thing. You ſay, that God will not fail to afford us grace, ſufficient to enable us to perſevere in well-doing, and if ſo, he will put his fear in our hearts without any of our own endeavours.

Secondly, God will not leave us unto our ſelves, when he hath put his fear in our hearts; he hath promiſed that he will never turn away from us to do us good, he will afford us the influences of his ſpirit, by which this fear ſhall be exerted, *Pſal.* 103. 17. *The mercy of the Lord is on them that fear him, from everlaſting to everlaſting*: He hath mercifully choſen them, and redeemed them, and ſanctified them, and he will mercifully guide them by his Counſel here, and mercifully ſave them hereafter; but how the mercy of the Lord may be ſaid to be from everlaſting to everlaſting on them that fear him, when yet ſuch as fear the Lord may fall away, and be damned, I do not know; nor how everlaſting mercy can leave the ſoul (that did once truly fear the Lord) under everlaſting miſery.

Thirdly, *That God that begins a good work in the ſoul*, (as he doth when he puts his fear into the heart) *will not ceaſe to perfect the ſame to the coming of Chriſt*, Phil. 1. *Jeſus Chriſt* hath promiſed, *that the water that he ſhall give, ſhall be in the ſoul a well of water, ſpringing up to everlaſting life*, John 4.

Fourthly, You ſay, God will not fail to do us good, nor to afford us grace, ſufficiently to enable us to continue in well-doing, if we are not backward to make good uſe of his grace.

Reply. There is no ſuch condition in the Text, neither expreſſed nor implied, and we muſt have a care of ſpeaking what the Word ſpeaks not; The promiſe

promiſe is abſolute, *That he will put his fear in their hearts, and that they ſhall not depart from him.*

You alledge here a ſaying of *Auſtin*, "That "God that made us without our ſelves, will not "ſave us without our ſelves.

Reply. This but a Humane Teſtimony, which ſignifies little with me; and if he means by this, that any thing done by us muſt be conſidered as a Condition, or as a Cauſe, together with the Free-grace of God, and the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt, (though in a ſubordinate way) I deny it.

Fifthly, You ſay, we are Agents, by the help of Grace, in the work of our Salvation.

Reply. If by Agents you intend Doers of that which does entitle us to Salvation, I deny it, and your bare ſay ſo will never prove it.

Sixthly, You ſay, it's very poſſible for us to fail of doing our duty, and therefore not impoſſible to break the Covenant of Grace.

Reply. Firſt, It's not poſſible for the ſubjects of this Covenant totally to fail of doing their duty; God hath promiſed to make them capable of their duty, granted by your ſelf, and that the promiſe is abſolute.

Secondly, God hath promiſed to put his ſpirit within them, that ſhall cauſe them to walk in his ſtatutes, and obſerve his Judgments, and do them, and that his Spirit ſhall be in them, and abide with them for ever, *John* 14. 16, 17. If the Spirit of God ſhall aſſiſt, and that always according, to the promiſe, then it is not poſſible for the Subjects of this Covenant ſo to fail of their duty as to break the Covenant of Grace, but it ſhall ſo, *&c.*

Thirdly, You ſay, I tell you, that I will endea-

vour

vour to put the matter beyond diſpute, and that firſt I labour to prove, that the Covenant can't be broken on God's part, this you ſay no body denies, therefore I might have ſpared my labour.

Reply. Firſt, Then I have gained the firſt point, that God will not break the covenant of Grace; and if ſo, then that Covenant which was made with all the people, was not the Covenant of Grace, for God himſelf broke that Covenant, *Zach.* 11. 10. *Then I took my ſtaff, even Beauty, and cut it aſunder, that I might break my Covenant that I had made with all the People, and it was broken in that day.*

Secondly, Having gained the firſt point, that God will not break the Covenant of Grace, it's a good ſtep towards the ſecond point, that the Subjects thereof ſhall not break it; for God hath covenanted not only for himſelf, but for them too. *Firſt*, That he will never turn away from them to do them good. *Secondly*, That he will put his fear into their Hearts, that they ſhall not depart from him: This Promiſe or Covenant is abſolute, notwithſtanding what you have offered againſt it. God hath covenanted to write his law in their hearts, that they ſhall all know him from the leaſt to the greateſt, that he will forgive their iniquities, and remember their ſins no more: Now if God will make good the Covenant on his part, all this ſhall be done for the ſubjects thereof; and this being once performed, it's impoſſible for the ſubjects thereof to break it: Can pardoned ſins break the Covenant? and have they any ſins that are not pardoned?

Secondly, You ſay, I endeavour to prove it cannot be broken by the ſubjects thereof, and that by three Arguments. My firſt Argument you ſay is this,

this, that all the sins of the subjects of this Covenant are pardoned upon Christ's satisfaction, *Col.* 2. 13, 14. that Christ gave himself for us, not to redeem us from some particular sins, but from all sins, *Tit.* 2. 14. that by one oblation he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified, *Heb.* 10. 14. All sins past, present, and to come, are remitted upon Christ's satisfaction; and if the sins of those that have an interest in this Covenant be all pardoned, how then can they break it? to this you Answer, That the satisfaction that Christ hath made to Divine Justice by the Sacrifice of himself, is the only meritorious cause of the Remission of Sin, and Eternal Salvation; but Christ satisfied to this end, that God might with safety to his Justice, pardon and justifie us upon our Faith and Repentance; for *God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sin that was past; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness, that God might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus*, Rom. 3. 25.

Reply. First, Here is a Grant given that the Justice of God is satisfied by that one Oblation of Christ; and if Justice be satisfied, the Debtor is discharged, Justice it self pleads his Discharge: It stays not for Faith and Repentance; *You who were dead in your sins hath he quickened together with Christ, having forgiven you all sins.* It's inconsistent with the righteousness of God, to hold a person under obligation unto Wrath, for whom the debt is paid by a surety. It's true, it was at the pleasure of God whether he would accept of satisfaction by a surety or no; he might have required the uttermost farthing of the sinner; but having in Grace and Mercy declared, that he would receive the debt at the hand

hand of a ſurety, and not only declared it, but bound himſelf by his Oath ſo to do, *Heb.* 7. 22. Chriſt was made a ſurety by the Oath of God; the Lord did not only ſwear him a High-Prieſt, as in the 21*ſt. verſe*, but he did alſo by the ſame Oath ſwear him a ſurety, *verſe* 22. Now the Debt being fully paid, he could not in Juſtice hold the ſinner in Obligation any longer.

Firſt, Not in Juſtice unto Chriſt, with whom he had covenanted to give up the Bond upon the payment of the Debt, and to diſcharge from the curſe thoſe for whom Jeſus Chriſt ſhould bear the curſe, therefore when the Covenant was confirmed by the blood of Jeſus Chriſt, he ſet the Priſoners at liberty, *Zach.* 9. 11. *As for thee, by the blood of thy Covenant I have ſent forth thy priſoners out of the pit, wherein there was no Water.*

Secondly, Not in juſtice unto thoſe for whom the Debt was paid by Chriſt, Juſtice it ſelf pleads their diſcharge, gives up the bond immediately; at the time when, and in the place where the debt was paid, the Bond was given up and cancell'd; *Col.* 2. 14. *Blotting out the Hand-writing of Ordinances that was againſt us, that was contrary to us, taking it out of the way, and nailing it unto the croſs.*

Secondly, You ſay, that God hath ſet forth Chriſt to be a propitiation through faith in his Blood.

Reply. Firſt, I would enquire, whether Chriſt be a propition for none but ſuch as have faith in in his blood? You ſay your ſelf, that Chriſt is the propitiation for the ſins of the whole world, and by the world you intend every individual perſon, and ſure I am that all men have not faith.

Secondly,

Secondly, Faith contributes nothing to his being a propitiation, it only applies him who is in himself our propitiation: If I rightly understand the word, it signifies a peace-making Sacrifice, and that he was in himself, antecedent to the Application that faith makes of him, *Eph.* 2. 14. he is our peace, *Col.* 1. 20. *Having made peace by the blood of his Cross*, Peace and Reconciliation were made by the Death of Christ, God was not made reconcileable only, (as some would have it) but reconciled; *All things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself, by Jesus Christ*, that is, by the death of Christ, *Rom.* 5. 10. *If when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.* God hath set forth Christ in his Word to be him that hath made peace, he hath commissioned his Ministers to go and proclaim this peace, 2 *Cor.* 5. *He hath committed unto them this word of reconciliation*; having made peace, he came and preached peace; he came by his Ministers, and it is their work where they come to publish this peace, *Isa.* 52. 7. They are not to put persons upon making their peace with God, but to accept of that peace that Christ has made. Now God having set forth Christ as a propitiation, he hath thereby declared how just and righteous a God he is, in the remission of sins, even the sins, that were past, for which God received not satisfaction till Christ was offered up.

Thirdly, You say, that as soon as we believe, and resolve to lead a new life, he pardoneth our sins and receiveth us into favour.

Reply. First, Either we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, or we were not: If we were, then our sins were pardoned at his death; *God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,*

not

not imputing unto them their treſpaſſes, 2 Cor. 5. If we were not reconciled by the death of his Son, then we ſhall never be reconciled; for if Chriſt hath not reconciled us by the blood of his Croſs, then hath he no other way of Reconciliation; Reconciliation is by his death, by his blood; he will die no more, he will bleed no more; now, to be reconciled to God, and not be received into favour, are terms inconſiſtent.

Secondly, Faith it ſelf is either a fruit of the favour of God, or it is not; if it be, then are we in the favour of God antecedent thereunto; if it be not, then ſhew me from whence it flows; it grows not in Natures Garden, we did not bring it with us into the World; *Faith is the gift of God*; is it then a gift of his Grace and Favour, or a gift of his Wrath?

Thirdly, I would enquire, who they are that ſhall live by Faith? whether they be the juſt or the unjuſt? if they be the juſt, then were they ſuch antecedent thereunto.

Fourthly, You ſay, that remiſſion of ſin is not granted immediately upon Chriſt's ſatisfaction; we muſt believe in Chriſt before we ſhall receive remiſſion of ſins; *For Chriſt is exalted on the right hand of God, and is become a Prince and a Saviour, to give repentance unto Iſrael, and remiſſion of ſins*, Acts 5. 31.

Reply. That remiſſion of ſin was granted out immediately upon ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, appears, *Firſt*, by the Teſtimony of the Holy Ghoſt, *Heb.* 10. 14, 15. *By one oblation he hath for ever perfected them that are ſanctified, whereof the Holy Ghoſt alſo is a witneſs, for after that he had ſaid before, This is the Covenant that I will make with them, I will write my Law in their hearts, and their ſins and iniqui-*

ties

ties will I remember no more. The perfection ſpoken of in the 14*th. verſe*, conſiſts in the pardon of ſin, granted by your ſelf *page* 17. and the word for ever, ſhews, it's all ſin, paſt, preſent, and to come; and this perfection or remiſſion was by that one offering, and that there was remiſſion by it the Holy Ghoſt is a witneſs, which plainly ſhews that from the time that Chriſt was offered up, at which time the New-Covenant was confirmed, God hath remitted the ſins of the Subjects thereof, and ſo remitted them, that he will remember them no more; now where remiſſion of theſe is, (ſaith the Apoſtle) there is no more ſacrifice for ſin. The reaſon why the ſacrifices under the Law were ſo often repeated, was, becauſe they did not do away ſin; their ſtanding daily miniſtring, and offering oft-times the ſame thing, was a demonſtration thereof: On the other hand, Chriſt's ſitting down on the right hand of God, after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſin, was a ſufficient demonſtration that ſin was done away by that one ſacrifice.

Seoondly, It appears, that ſin was remitted immediately by the ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, in that thoſe for whom Chriſt was wounded were then healed, 1 *Pet.* 2.24. *By whoſe ſtripes ye were healed:* He ſpeaks in the preterperfect tenſe, our ſins were laid upon Chriſt, he bare them in his own body upon the tree, there they were, what is become of them? is he diſcharged from them, or is he not? if he be not, he muſt bear them for ever; if he be, are they returned upon us, or are they not? if they are, then we are not healed by his ſtripes, and that is croſs to the Text; if they are not, then was ſin remitted immediately upon Chriſt's oblation.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, It appears, in that Redemption was by the blood of Christ, *Eph.* 1. 7. Now redemption and remission of sin is the same thing; *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin.* Either we had remission of sin by the blood of Christ, or we had not; if we had, then was sin remitted immediately, upon satisfaction made by Christ, (for it was by his blood he made satisfaction) if we had not remission of sins by his blood, then they will never be remitted, for without shedding of blood there is no remission, *Heb.* 9. 22.

Fourthly, If we were redeemed from the curse of the Law when Christ was made a curse for us, then was sin remitted from the time he made satisfaction; but we were so, *Gal.* 3. 13. *He hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us:* To be redeemed from the curse of the Law, and not to be discharged from sin, are terms inconsistent: If we are not discharged from sin, then we are under the curse of the Law; and how great an inconsistency is this, to be redeemed from the Curse, and yet to be still under the Curse.

Fifthly, If the Bond was given up immediately upon satisfaction made by Christ, then sin was immediately remitted upon satisfaction made by Christ; but the Bond was given up immediately upon satisfaction made by Christ, *Col.* 2. 13. Now in giving up the Bond by the Creditor, there is a discharge given: Who looks for any other discharge from a debt than for the Bond to be given up and cancell'd by the Creditor, upon the payment of the Debt.

Sixthly, If there be nothing to be laid to the charge of Gods Elect, from the time of the satisfaction made by Christ, then are they immediately

diately discharged from the time of the satisfaction made by him, but there is nothing to be laid to the charge of Gods Elect, from the time of the satisfaction made by Christ, *Rom.* 8.33. *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of Gods Elect? It's God that justifies, who shall condemn? It's Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again:* By his death he procured our Discharge, by his Resurrection he made it manifest, *Rom.* 4. *ult.* The not charging with guilt is a Discharge from guilt; Remission of sin, and the Non-imputation of sin, is the same thing, *Rom.* 4. 7, 8. You say, we must believe in Christ before we shall receive remission of sin.

Reply. I grant it, it's one thing for God to remit sin, and another thing for us to receive it; remission of sin is the Gift of God, now a Gift may be bestowed upon a person long before he receives it; a Legacy may be given upon will, and when the Testator is dead the will is of force, the gift is his, yet he may not know of it, nor receive it till some time after. The Atonement was made by the death of Christ, *Rom.* 5. 10. but we receive it not till we believe, *verse* 11. Justification is sometimes held forth before Faith, *Rom.* 4. *He justifieth the ungodly.* An Ungodly Person and a Believer are two things; he justifieth the Elect, *Rom.* 8.33. and they are more in number than Believers. It is sometimes held forth by Faith; now when Justification is held forth antecedent unto Faith, and also by Faith, it must be taken in a different acceptation. As it's strictly and properly considered a discharge from guilt, and a title unto Life and Glory, so it consists in the imputation of Righteousness, not in the Application thereof, *Rom.* 4. 6, 7, 8. *Rom.* 5. 18. *The free gift came upon all men, to the justification of life*; that is, all men that stand related to the Second *Adam*; and how did it come on them? why together

gether and at once, even as Condemnation came on all Men together and at once; but as Justification is considered in point of Acceptation, and Termination in our own Consciences, so it is by Faith; *Even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ*, Gal. 2. 16. In this sense Faith hath that hand in our Justification that no other Grace hath; it's the nature of Faith to empty the soul of all self-righteousness, of every thing of our own, and to carry the Soul to Christ, to receive all from him; *I would not be found in mine own righteousness, which is of the Law, but in the righteousness of God, which is by Faith in Jesus Christ*, Phil. 3. Faith never pleads good Works performed by us as the condition, and so challenges remission upon it, as the effect of such performance. It follows not that we are not justified in the former sense before we believe, because we are not justified in the latter sense till we believe, no more than it will follow that we are not justified by Faith alone in point of Acceptation, because we are justified by Works in point of Manifestation, *James* 2. 24, 25. as for that Text *Acts* 5. 31. you brought to prove Repentance antecedent to Remission of sins, though Christ gives both, and Repentance be first mentioned, yet it follows not that Repentance is first bestowed; no Argument can be drawn from order of Words in this case, other Scriptures placing Remission before Repentance, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. there saving is before calling, *Isa.* 44. 25. *I have blotted out thy Transgressions as a cloud, and as a thick cloud thy sins, therefore return unto me*, Isa. 43. 25. There you have remission of sin, but not one Token of Repentance in the subjects antecedent thereunto, as you may see from the 21*st.* verse.

Fifthly, You say, though Christ gave himself to redeem us from all iniquity, yet none are actually freed from

from the guilt of sin till they forsake it.

Reply. To be redeemed from sin, and to be under the guilt of sin, are Terms inconsistent, for redemption from sin, and remission of sin, is the same thing, *Eph.* 1.7. *In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sin:* Either Christ (when he gave himself to redeem us from all Iniquity) did what he gave himself to do, or he did not; if he did, then are we discharged from guilt; if he did not, it was for want of Merit in his Blood, and that is Blasphemy to assert. I gave you this Argument in my last, but you made no reply to it.

Sixthly, You say, that we need no new Oblation to merit remission of sins; *For by one Offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified,* Heb. 10. 14. Yet we must be in Christ, and sanctified, before we can be perfected, that is, pardoned, and acquitted from the guilt of sin.

Reply. First, Here is a grant that sanctified ones are perfected, that is, pardoned, and acquitted from the guilt of sin: This being granted, it will follow undeniably, that they are for ever pardoned; now this will do my Business: For, *First,* All the Subjects of the New Covenant shall in time be sanctified. *First,* Christ gave himself to that end, *Eph.* 5. He loved the Church, and gave himself for them, that he might sanctifie and cleanse them, *&c.* Secondly, *God hath promised that he will write his Law in their hearts, that they shall all know him,* Heb. 8. and this is also granted by your self, *page* 31, 32.

Secondly, When sanctified, they are for ever pardoned, *Heb.* 8. 12. *I will be merciful to their iniquities, and will remember their sins no more:* And this also is in effect granted by your self in the preceeding lines, so that I have now gained the second point, that the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace cannot break it,

their sins being all pardoned, and pardoned sins can't break it. You say, the Subjects of this Covenant must be in Christ, and sanctified, before they be pardoned.

Reply. First, I have already proved that the Subjects of this Covenant are in Christ, antecedent to their sanctification, *John* 17. 2. They were given to Christ by the Father, before eternal Life was given to them by the Son, they were Christs people before they were a willing people, *Psal.* 110. 3.

Secondly, The word sanctified is diversly taken, sometimes for a Separation: *Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, that he blasphemeth?* what is that sanctification but a separation? God had chosen Christ from among the number of Mankind, and set him apart for so great an undertaking, and in this sense I take the Word sanctified in the Text that is before us, *Heb.* 10. 14. Them that God had set apart for himself, for they only were the Subjects for whom Christ was offered up, *Isa.* 53. 8. *For the transgressions of my people was he stricken*; but if the word sanctified must be taken properly, as you would have it, then must it be considered as the Mark or Character of those who in time may be known to be of the number of those that were for ever pardoned by that one Oblation; we can no more conclude that they were sanctified before they were pardoned, than we can conclude that those for whom these great things that eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor had entered into the Heart of man, were prepared, did love God before they were prepared for them, 1 *Cor.* 2. 9. It was solely by that one offering, without any act of theirs, that they were for ever perfected or pardoned; the Holy Ghost is a witness to this truth, that upon this one offering God would remember their sins no more; this perfection or pardon that was by this one offer-

offering was antecedent to his ſitting down on the right hand of God, *verſes* 12, 13. *But this man after he had offered one ſacrifice for ſin, for ever ſat down at the right hand of God*; and why ſo? *but becauſe by that one offering he had for ever perfected them that were ſanctified:* It was the end of Chriſt in offering up himſelf to put away ſin by this one ſacrifice, *Heb.* 9. 26. and this end of his was anſwered before he aſcended to the Father, *Heb.* 1. 3. When he had by himſelf purged our ſins, for ever ſat down at the right hand of God; eternal redemption was obtained for us, before he entered into the holy place, *Heb.* 9. 12.

Seventhly, You ſay, that none but thoſe that confeſs their ſins, and forſake them, ſhall have mercy, *Prov.* 28. 13.

Reply. Firſt, There is Mercy extended to Men in the change of the Heart, by which they are made capable to confeſs their ſins and forſake them, *Tit.* 3. 5. this mercy they muſt have, antecedent to their Confeſſion.

Secondly, There is the mercy of the ſenſible enjoyment of the pardon of Sin, and this mercy I grant you none ſhall have till they confeſs and forſake their ſin; but to ſay, that none ſhall have mercy till they confeſs their ſins, without any diſtinction of Mercy, will run a man upon upon great abſurdities; the Scripture tells us, *The mercy of the Lord is from everlaſting to everlaſting upon them that fear him*, Pſal. 103. 17. God extends much of mercy e're ever the ſoul can confeſs and forſake ſin.

Eighthly, You ſay, that if the ſins of the Elect are forgiven upon the bare ſatisfaction made by Chriſt, then they ſhould be juſtified before Converſion, and be at once in a ſtate of pardon and ſalvation, and in a ſtate of Wrath and Condemnation too; but as long as they continue in their ſins, ſo long they are liable to the Wrath of God, ſo long they are liable to condemnation.

Reply. First, I would query, Whether there be any thing to be laid to the charge of Gods Elect? If there be, then pray answer the Apostles challenge, *Rom.* 8. 33. If there be not, then are they discharged upon the bare satisfaction made by Christ.

Secondly, I would enquire, Whether the bare satisfaction made by Christ, be full satisfaction unto the Justice of God or not? If it be not, by whom then shall the Justice of God be satisfied? if it be, then Justice it self pleads their discharge, gives up the Bond, holds the principal in obligation no longer, *Colos.* 2. 14.

You say, that then they should be justified before Conversion.

Reply. I grant it; this runs me upon no absurdity, *Rom.* 4. *He justifieth the ungodly.*

You say, that then they must be in a state of Justification, and in a state of Condemnation at the same time, for so long as they continue in their sins and their impenitency, so long they are liable to wrath and condemnation.

Reply. First, I would enquire how the Elect may be said to be under Condemnation, seeing the Word declares, that there is nothing to be laid to their charge, and that *It is God that justifies*, Rom. 8. 33. that Interrogation, *Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's Elect?* implies a Negation, *None shall*; *Who shall condemn?* there is another Interrogation, which also implies a Negation, *None shall condemn*; *It's God that justifies*, and sure I am, that none can condemn where God justifies; *It's Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again:* Their Discharge bears date from his death, and the manifestation thereof from the time of his Resurrection.

Secondly, How the Elect can be said to be under the wrath of God, seeing all that wrath that was due to them,

them, was poured on the Lord Jesus as their surety, and in their stead, *Isa.* 53. 4. *Surely, he hath born our griefs, he hath carried our sorrows*; that which was due to us, and which we should have born, *verse* 5. *He was wounded for our transgressions, and by his stripes are we healed*, verse 6. *All we like sheep are gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.*

Thirdly, How the Elect can be said to be under the Wrath of God, that are delivered from it by Christ, 1 *Thes.* 1. 10. *Even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come*; when he bore it for them, he bore it from them.

Fourthly, I would query, How this Wrath should be appeased, if the Elect are yet under it? I know no way to appease the Wrath of God, but by bearing of it; Jesus Christ had no other way, he hath born it already, he will bear it no more, he is discharged, he is justified, 1 *Tim.* 3. *ult.* The Elect can't bear it, it would sink them down to Hell; the wicked that are damned for their own sin shall not bear it, they shall only bear that which was due for their own sin, not that which was due to the Elect; what then shall become of this Wrath?

Fifthly, If the Elect are under the Wrath of God till they do believe, and upon believing it's removed, whether there be more vertue in an act of Faith than there was in all the sufferings of Christ? or whether the efficacy of Christ's sufferings depends on the will or act of the Creature?

Sixthly, How the Elect of God could ever have believed and repented, if they had been still under the Wrath of God? They must be delivered from the curse of the Law, before the blessing of *Abraham* could come upon them, *Gal.* 3. 13, 14. They must become dead to the Law by the Body of Christ, before they could be married unto Christ, *Rom.* 7. 4.

Seventhly, Whether the Wrath of God, ſtrictly and properly conſidered, be not a will in God to puniſh? And if ſo, whether it be ſtill the Will of God to puniſh the Elect, now he hath laid that which was due to them on the Lord Jeſus? Or whether the will of God be mutable, and ſo changed when they do believe? if it be objected, that the Scripture tells us, *That he that believeth not, ſhall not ſee life, but the wrath of God abideth on him*, John 3. ult. I anſwer, it muſt be underſtood of final Unbelief. Should a perſon argue thus, but ſome Elect do not believe at preſent, therefore ſome Elect are under the wrath of God; I might as well argue from the ſame, but ſome Elect do not believe at preſent, therefore ſome Elect ſhall not ſee life. Your own Principles would not bear this, and ſuch kind of arguing has a tendency in it to block up the way of Salvation for ever: Had you muſtered up thoſe Scriptures that ſeem to favour your Opinion in this point, I doubt not but I ſhould have returned a rational Anſwer to what might have been objected from each of them, as I have done in the like caſe.

Ninthly, You ſay, if the promiſe of Juſtification be made, only upon the condition of Faith and Repentance, then we can have no right to it, till we perform that condition.

Reply. I grant it, were the promiſe ſo made, but that's the thing denied by me, and not proved by you.

Tenthly, You ſay, it's too poſſible for us, through our own default, to neglect that condition, and ſo to fruſtrate the means of our own Salvation.

Reply. Setting aſide the word condition, (for I own no ſuch thing, and I ſhall find another place to ſpeak to it) I deny that it is poſſible, for the ſubjects of this Covenant to live and dye unbelievers, and ſo to fruſtrate the means of their Salvation. For,

Firſt,

First, They *are chosen unto Holiness*, Eph. 1. 4. *predestinated to be conformable to the Image of his Son*, Rom. 8. 29. *Elected to salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth*, 2 Thes. 2. 13.

Secondly, It was the end of Christ in Dying, *That he might sanctifie and cleanse them*, Eph. 5. 25, 26. *That he might purifie them to himself*, Tit. 2. 14.

Thirdly, God hath promised, *To write his Law in their hearts, that they shall all know him from the least to the greatest*, Jer. 31. 33.

Fourthly, Christ standsengaged by Covenant with the Father to bring them to believe, *John* 10. *Other sheep have I that are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one shepherd and one sheepfold.*

Fifthly, Christ hath assured us, *That all that the Father hath given him shall come unto him*, John 6. 37. *That he will give eternal life to all that the father hath given unto him*: Now unless the Decree of God be altered, the end of Christ in dying frustrated, the promise of God of none effect, the Covenant between the Father and the Son broken, and the Assurance that Christ hath given fail us, it is not possible that the Subjects of this Covenant should live and dye Unbelievers. Take notice I speak of grown persons; as for such of them as dye in their infancy, though they are incapable of actual Faith, I doubt not but they have the habit infused by an immediate work of the Spirit, before they go hence.

But you say, the Apostle does suppose, that we may neglect the Condition, and so frustrate thē means of Salvation, *Heb.* 2. 3.

Reply. You mistake the Apostle here, he doth not suppose that any of the subjects of this Covenant might neglect the means, so as to frustrate the end; he only declares, that those that do neglect the means shall miss of the end, and that they shall not escape punishment, be they

they who they will, and I dare boldly say, that those that do totally and finally neglect the means, and so fall short of the end, are not the Subjects of this Covenant. Before I leave this Head I shall mind you of two things: *First*, I told you that Christ hath not only redeemed from all sin, but he hath eternally redeemed, that the Soul shall never come under guilt more; there is not a Word of reply to this. *Secondly*, You have in your Answer all along insisted upon the time of our pardon, and have said little to the Argument it self, whether pardoned sins can break this Covenant.

You say, my Second Argument that I offered to prove, that the Covenant of Grace can't be broken by the Subjects thereof, was this, that if those that have an interest in this Covenant may break it, who then shall remain interested in it? Here again you alter my words; I said, if the sins of those that have an interest in it may break it, who then shall remain interested in it? For in many things we offend all, and I did judge you did not distinguish between venial and mortal sins. Sin as sin deserves Death, now having altered my Argument, you answer your self and not me: Your Answer to it is this, that there is no Consequence from the Power to the Act.

Reply. I did not argue from the Power to the Act, from a possibility to a certainty, but from a certainty it's certain that all do sin, and that the wages of sin is death; if then the sins of the Subjects of this Covenant may break it, who can remain interested in it?

Secondly, You say, the Holy Angels before their confirmation were in a mutable state, and had a possibility of falling, yet they did not fall.

Reply. That the Angels had a possibility of falling, as they were considered in themselves, I grant, but as they were considered Elect Angels, I deny that it was possible for them to fall; for it was not possible for God to alter, or

change his Decree concerning their ſtanding; ſo hatever poſſibility may be ſuppoſed to be in the ſubcts of this Covenant to looſe their Intereſt therein, onſidered in themſelves, yet as they are conſidered the lect of God, the redeemed of the Lord, and ſecured y the promiſes of this Covenant, it is not poſſible that ney ſhould break it, and ſo looſe their intereſt therein.

My third Argument, you ſay, to prove that the Subcts of this Covenant can't break it, is drawn from *Jer.* 2. 40. and this you ſuppoſe I do moſtly inſiſt upon, beauſe I have often mentioned the Text.

Reply. I have not mentioned it oftner than I had occaſin, and yet I ſuppoſe there is weight enough in the other wo, if this were left out, only I am not willing to ſpare ither, becauſe a threefold-cord is not ſoon broken.

Firſt, You ſay, this Text has been anſwered already.

Reply. Your Anſwer has been already replied to, and roved invalid.

Secondly, You ſay the uttermoſt that can be gathered rom this Text is, that God will not fail to perform his art of that Covenant; he will afford us Grace, whereby we co-working ſhall be enabled to live in his fear, and ot depart from him, which nothing hinders but that his Covenant may be broken by us.

Reply. Firſt, This Scripture is abundantly clearer, if taken as it lieth, without any expoſition, than you have made it by that you have ſaid.

Secondly, Here is nothing more than I had before, you had as good have referred me to your former Anſwer.

Thirdly, If God will not fail to perform his part of the Covenant, he will put his fear in our Hearts, that we ſhall not depart from him, for this is his part of the Covenant, and this will hinder the breach of this Covenant, I can't ſee that one my of Arguments that I brought, to prove that the Covenant of Grace can't be broken by the

the Subjects thereof, is in the least shaken by your Answers.

SECT. VI.

YOU say, I make some Exceptions against the reasons that you brought to prove the possibility of the breach of this Covenant.

First, You say I argue thus, That it is not possible to receive the Grace of God in vain, because God hath promised *to put his fear into our hearts, that we shall not depart from him.* To this you say, that tho' God hath promised *To work in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure, yet we must work out our own salvation*, Phil. 2. 12, 13.

Reply. I grant it, as Salvation may be considered, as an end following means preparing, but not as it may be considered as an end depending on means procuring: And here for our encouragement to our duty, we have this laid down as a motive, *It's God that worketh in us both to will and to do of his own good pleasure*; and will and do we shall, we have the promise of both, *Psal.* 110. 3. *Ezek.* 36. 27. *The grace of God*, when received, *shall be in us a well of Water, springing up to everlasting life*; so that it shall not be received in vain; the Apostle tells us, 1 *Cor.* 15. 10. that this Grace which was bestowed upon him was not in vain.

Secondly, You say, that Gods working in us doth not exclude our endeavours.

Reply. I grant it, it is so far from excluding our endeavours, that it puts us forward; if God did not work in us a will, there would be no endeavours at all.

Thirdly, You say, that God will not keep us by his Grace in his fear, unless we labour to work together with this Grace.

Reply. There is no such Condition in the Text, nor any

ny thing that looks like it, nor in the Word any where lſe; and we ſhould have a care of adding to the Word, eſt God reprove us.

Secondly, Whilſt the Lord keeps us in his fear, we are ept in action.

Thirdly, Our Labour and Endeavour is, that which he fear of God doth engage us in, it is a means to keep rom evil, and to put us forward in our duty.

Fourthly, You ſay, if we muſt co-work with Grace, hen we are not neceſſitated unto good, and ſo may poſ-bly receive the Grace of God in vain.

Reply. If by co-working with Grace, you mean our ving in the exerciſe of Grace, I grant it is a Chriſtians uty, but this implies not a poſſibility of receiving the race of God in vain; for when a Soul is principled with he Grace of God, he will ſo influence and aſſiſt him by is Spirit, that he ſhall live in the exerciſe thereof; he ath promiſed to put his Spirit within him, and cauſe im to walk in his ſtatutes, and to obſerve his judg-nents, and do them, *Pſal.* 48. 14. *This God is our God, ven our own God, he will be our Guide to death:* Faith nuſt have ſome promiſe to bottom upon, or it ould not make this concluſion. The fear of the ord, influenced by the Spirit of the Lord, doth eceſſitate the Soul to that which is good, we can do othing againſt the Truth, but for the Truth, we can-ot but ſpeak the things that we have ſeen and eard; ſaith the Apoſtle, *And he that is born of God oth not commit ſin, neither can he, becauſe he is born of od, for his ſeed remaineth in him*, 1 John 3. 9. You rant, *page* 27. that a regenerate man can't allow him-elf in any known evil, whilſt he remains regenerate, nd is there not the ſame reaſon to conclude, that he an't allow himſelf in the omiſſion of any known uty.

Fifthly, You ſay, it's poſſible for thoſe *Who have eſcaped*

escaped the Pollutions of the World, through the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, to be entangled again and overcome, 2 Pet. 2. 20. but Hypocrites can't be said to escape the Pollutions of the World, seeing they continue still in their filthiness.

Reply. By the Pollutions of the World I understand outward gross Sins, which the World for the most part does live and wallow in, as the Sow wallows in the mire; such Pollutions as are visible, that from a common Illumination and Conviction they had escaped; and in this Sense a Hypocrite may be said to escape from them, *Mat* 2. 3. they appeared outwardly righteous to Men, and yet Hypocrites; and to give any other Sense of that in *Peter*, will not harmonize with other Scriptures, which hold forth the perseverance of the Saints. An Apostate is nothing else but an Hypocrite unvailed.

Secondly, You say, I tell you, that such as are externally called by the Preaching of the Word may forsake their own Mercy; but such as are internally called and converted, can't possibly abuse the Grace of God, and so come short of Happiness. To this you Answer, that all that are externally called by the preaching of the Word, have inward Grace offered them, sufficient to convert them.

Reply. The Question is not, what Grace is offered them, but what Grace is given them; are there Hearts changed? are they made of unwilling to be willing? or is there any promise of such a thing made to any, but those that are the People of Christ? You say your self, that unless the Heart and Will be reformed, we can't do what God requires.

Secondly, You say, it is not only a vain thing, but a cruel kind of Insultation, to exhort Men to repent, and to amend, unless they have means allowed them sufficient to amend.

Reply

Reply. The Queſtion ſtill is, Whether all that are externally called by the Word, have the firſt Degree of Grace, by which their underſtandings are enlightned, and their Wills reformed? Theſe bleſſings you confeſs'd are always ſuppoſed as neceſſary to enable us to do what God requires of us; and unleſs you can prove this, your Charge is high, to ſay, it's a cruel kind of Inſultation over Men to require them to repent; for I can aſſure you, that God requires all Men every where to repent, and to believe, where the Goſpel comes; you ſay your ſelf, that it's impoſſible for Men to repent without the Grace of God, now it is not Grace offered, but Grace infuſed that doth capacitate Men truly to repent; and this you can never prove, that all that are externally called by the Word, have ſuch a meaſure of Grace beſtowed on them. The contrary lieth plain before us in the Word; there were four ſorts of ground, *Mark* 4. on which the Seed fell, and but one of them that had it's Nature changed, the other three remained the ſame, High-way, Stony, and Thorny-ground, as it was before ever the Seed fell upon it, and more inſtances I ſhall give you in another place.

Thirdly, You ſay, if Men may fruſtrate God's Mercy in calling of them by his Word, then they muſt needs withal reſiſt his Grace that accompanies his Word.

Reply. If this were granted you, it would not advantage you; if Men may reſiſt that Grace that accompanies the Word, what is this to prove, that Men may receive the Grace of God in vain? it is one thing for a Perſon to refuſe what Grace is offered, and another thing to receive the Grace of God in vain.

Fourthly, You ſay, it is not only poſſible for thoſe that are externally called to hinder their Converſion, but thoſe that are Converted may through their own default turn to their old Sins again, and forſake the way of Life.

Reply.

Reply. All that I shall say to this at present, is barely to deny that such as are truly Converted, that are brought to accept of Jesus Christ on Gospel-terms, and to rest on him alone for Salvation, can possibly fall away, that is, totally and finally, though they may foully back-slide; and this I shall make good, when I come particularly to handle the Perseverance of the Saints.

Fifthly, You say, the Text alledged by me does not prove the contrary, *John* 6. 37. *All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me.*

Reply. I brought not this Scripture to prove, that those that are Converted can't possibly forsake the way of Life; nor yet that *Rom.* 8. that which I brought them for together, with *John* 10. 16. which you have omitted, was to prove, that not one of the Subjects of the New Covenant should go without an Effectual Call, and for this they were all pertinent, but they must now stand as you have placed them.

You say, that those *John* 6. 37. that are said to be given unto Jesus Christ, are meant those whose Hearts are disposed and prepared by God's preventing Grace to come to Jesus Christ, and not a select number chosen of God to Life Eternal, because it is expresly affirmed of one of this number, that he is lost, *John* 17. 12. *Those whom thou hast given me I have kept, and none of them is lost, but the Son of Perdition.*

Reply. This Exposition does not suit the Text, nor harmonize with other Scriptures.

First, You say, that those that are said to be given to Christ, are such whose Hearts are prepared and disposed by preventing Grace to come to Jesus Christ.

Reply. First, The Text speaks not of any such Disposition, but of a Gift; *All that the Father giveth me:* Now this Gift of the Father to the Son, is antecedent to such a Disposition: Thy People, before they were a willing People, *Psalm* 110. 3. and if so, then were they

they Christ's People before this Disposition was wrought in them, *John* 17.2. *That I may give Eternal Life to as many as thou hast given unto me:* They were given unto Christ before Eternal Life was given unto them by Christ.

Secondly, I would Query, Whether *Judas* (which I think is here intended by *the Son of Perdition*) that you say was one of this number, had his Heart thus prepared and disposed to come to Jesus Christ? and whether he did come to him? The Text tells us, *That all that the Father giveth unto Christ shall come unto him:* Had he the first Degree of Grace, whereby his Understanding was enlightened, his Will renewed, his Heart and Will changed? I can't find such Characters of him in the Word, *John* 6. 70. *Have not I chosen you twelve, and one of you is a Devil*; this he spake of *Judas* at the very same time, when he tells you, *That all that the Father giveth me shall come unto me:* He had not then such a Disposition, and yet you say that he was one of that number, *verse* 64. There are some of you that believe not, (and was not *Judas* one of these) he knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray him; in the heighth of his Profession, he was a covetous Person, a notorious Hypocrite, and a Thief, and was this one of that number of whom Christ spake, *That they should come unto him, and that he would in no wise cast out, that they should not perish, but have everlasting Life?* it does not look as if he were.

Secondly, You say, they are not a select number chosen of God to Life Eternal.

Reply. This agrees not with the Text, nor doth it harmonize with other Scriptures.

First, They are such as shall come to Jesus Christ: *All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me.* Coming and believing is the same thing, *verse* 35. and such as do believe in Christ are of the number of Gods Elect, 1 *Thess.* 1. 4. *Knowing Brethren your Election of God, for*

our Gospel came not unto you in Words only, but in Power, and in the Holy Ghost: If the Gospel works so powerfully as to engage the Soul to come to Jesus Christ, he may from thence argue his Election of God; they were the Fathers in a peculiar Sense that were given to the Son, *John* 17. 6. *Thine they were, and thou gavest them unto me:* Thine not only by Creation, for so were the World also, that were distinct from them, therefore it must be by Election, *verse* 10. *And all mine are thine.* Those that are the Sons by fœderal Relation, they are the Fathers by Election.

Secondly, They are such as shall be saved, *verse* 40. *And this is the Will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, should not perish, but have Everlasting Life.* If coming and believing be the same thing, (as I think none will deny) then *All that the Father hath given him, shall be saved*, and yet are they not a select People. You grant, *Page* 51. that none but the Elect, or faithful persevering Christians, (which I think is the same thing) shall be saved; if those then that are given to the Son shall be saved, they are Elect; Salvation is the end that they are chosen to, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13.

Thirdly, You say, that one of this number was finally lost, *John* 17. 12.

Reply. I doubt this will reflect upon Christ, either upon his Power, or upon his Faithfulness.

First, There is no such Word in the Text, nor yet in the whole Chapter.

Secondly, The contrary will appear from the same Text, together with the following Verses; the Text tells you, *That all that the Father giveth him, shall come unto him, and he that comes unto him he will in no wise cast out:* Thus far they are all safe, *verse* 38. *I came down from Heaven, not to do my own Will, but the Will of him that sent me, and this is the Will of him that sent me, that of all*

that

that he had given me I ſhould looſe nothing, but ſhould raiſe it up at the laſt day. Chriſt hath undertaken to keep thoſe that are given him of the Father, and it was the Fathers Will that they ſhould be kept; if then there be any one of theſe loſt, it muſt be, either becauſe he would have kept them, but could not, or becauſe he could have kept them, but would not: Take it in the firſt Senſe, and it taxeth his Power; in the ſecond Senſe, it taxeth his Faithfulneſs; and this will not only reflect upon the Son, but upon the Father alſo, making his Will mutable: It was the Will of the Father they ſhould be all kept, and that none of them ſhould be loſt: And as for *Judas* that was ſaid to be loſt, *John* 17. 12. it is moſt certain that he was not given unto Chriſt, in the Senſe that thoſe were that are here ſaid to be given to him, to be kept by him; for if he had, he ſhould have been kept as well as others: It was the Will of the Father, *that of all that he had given him he ſhould looſe nothing*. He was indeed given to Chriſt as an Apoſtle as well as *Peter* and the reſt, and in this Senſe I take the Word, *John* 17. 12. and that for this Reaſon, becauſe it is reſtricted to the Apoſtles in the fulfilling of it, *John* 18. 8, 9. *If ye ſeek me, let theſe go their way, that it might be fulfilled, as he ſaid, of them that thou haſt given me I have loſt none.*

The next Scripture you come to conſider, is *Rom.* 8. 29, 30. You ſay, the proper Senſe of that Text is, thoſe whom God hath predetermined to Sufferings after the manner of Chriſt, he hath called to ſuffer, and thoſe he hath called to ſuffer, them he doth upon the Trial of their Patience and Conſtancy juſtifie, and thoſe that continue in a juſtified State he will reward with Eternal Glory.

Reply. I muſt take this Expoſition upon your bear Word, without any Proof or Argument, without any thing in the Text or Context that leads to it. *Firſt,*

They are predeſtinated to ſufferings after the manner of Chriſt, but why to ſufferings only? what is there in the Text that leads to that? the Text tells you, it is *to be conformable to the Image of the Son*, which conſiſts in a likeneſs unto Chriſt: When God made Man after his own Image, he made him in his own likeneſs, which conſiſted in Knowledge, Righteouſneſs, and Holineſs. The Text does not limit this Conformity to Sufferings. *Secondly*, Chriſt hath given us a Pattern in his Active as well as in his Paſſive obedience, and he that ſaith, *He abideth in him, ought ſo to walk even as Chriſt alſo walked.*

Secondly, You ſay, that them he calleth unto Sufferings.

Reply. Here is a Limitation again that is not in the Text. Thoſe that God calleth according to his purpoſe, he calleth unto Holineſs, called to be Saints, called to Active as well as Paſſive Obedience.

Thirdly, You ſay, that thoſe whom he calleth to Sufferings, them upon the Trial of their Patience and Conſtancy he juſtifieth.

Reply. Firſt, I would know how long they muſt be upon Trial; not to their lives end, that can't be, their Patience may not hold out ſo long; you ſeem to hint, that they may fall from a juſtified State as well as from a ſanctified State.

Fourthly, You ſay, that thoſe that continue in a juſtified State, them he Rewards with Eternal Glory.

Reply. Firſt, I would know, Whether this Reward be of Grace or no? for it ſeems to hang upon ſo many Conditions, that it's a Queſtion, whether it be of Grace, or a Debt.

Secondly, I do not find in Scripture, that there is ſo much Trial of Mens Patience and Conſtancy, antecedent to their Juſtification. The Text ſaith, *Whom he calleth, them he juſtifieth*; but according to your Interpretation,

terpretation, its rational to think, that ſome may be called that are never juſtified.

Thirdly, If you caſt your Eye upon the Text once more, you may ſee the Apoſtle ſpeaks not of Acts of Grace in time, but of the eternal Decrees of God, in which reſpect we are to conſider every link of this golden Chain; it's Vocation decreed, and Juſtification, and Glorification decreed, and each link reſpects the ſame individual Perſons, and all the links of this Chain were ſet together in the Counſel of God from Eternity; it is not ſaid he will Call, and he will Juſtifie, and Glorifie, but he Called, and Juſtified, and Glorified; ſo that it will by no means admit of ſuch an Interpretation as you have here given of it; there is no time for the Trial of Mens Patience and Conſtancy, nor is there any poſſibility that any ſhould fall from a Juſtified State, there are no ſuch Proviſo's in the Decrees of God.

Secondly, You have yet ſomething more to offer from this Text: You ſay, that the Connexion here ſet between Vocation, Juſtification, and Glorification in reſpect of the Elect, is firm, and indiſſoluble, for the Elect in time are called, are juſtified, and ſhall not fall away, but ſhall ſurely be glorified.

Reply. This is ſomething, the other was juſt nothing; here is a grant that the Elect ſhall perſevere, and ſhall be ſaved at laſt, and there are no other that are intended in the Text but the Elect only; but in my Judgment this ſecond Expoſition does not harmonize with your firſt; there is a hint that a juſtified Perſon may not continue in a juſtified State, and how a poſſibility of falling, and a certainty of ſtanding may both be gathered from the ſame Text, with reſpect to the ſame ſubjects, I do not know.

Secondly, Though I like your Aſſertion well, that the Elect ſhall perſevere, yet I do not like the ground

of it, which you say is this, because they were considered in the prevision of God, as persevering in Holiness unto the end; and it's a Contradiction to say, that they that persevere shall fall away.

Reply. God did not Elect upon a foresight of what we would be, but to what we should be, *Eph.* 1. 4. *He hath chosen us in him before the Foundation of the World, that we should be Holy, and without blame before him in Love:* He hath chosen unto Holiness, and to Perseverance, both proved by the same Text that is before us, *Whom he did foreknow, or foreacknowledge to be his,* (so you read it your self) *he did predestinate to be conformable to the Image of his Son*; which is, to Holiness, and Perseverance therein. Christ hath set us a Pattern of both, a Pattern of Piety, and Perseverance therein, and they are absolutely decreed to be conformable to Christ in both.

Again, You say, That all that are called, and really Converted, are not Elected, nor are they so secured by Grace that they shall not fall away; for they that have a good Conscience may make Shipwrack of Faith, and no Hypocrite may be said to have a good Conscience, 1 *Tim.* 2. 19.

Reply. First, I deny, that any but the Elect of God are in time called, that is, brought truly to believe in Jesus Christ, (for that is the Call you intend.) *First*, There is no Scripture to prove this. *Secondly*, The contrary is to be proved by Scripture, *Rom.* 11. 7. *What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he sought after, but the Election hath obtained, and the rest were blinded.* Conversion is so peculiarly the priviledge of the Elect, that from the one the other may be argued, 1 *Thess.* 1. 4. *Knowing, Brethren, beloved, your Election of God, for our Gospel came not unto you in Word only, but in Power,* &c. If the Gospel powerfully Work to Conversion, it's an infallible mark of Election; on the same ground did *Peter* stile the Church he wrote to in his first Epistle, E-

lect,

lect; they were such as had obtained like precious Faith, and from thence he concludes them God's Elect. *We are bid to make our Calling and our Election sure*, 2 Pet. 1. 10. but if a Person may be effectually called that is not elected, then is there no room to make our Election sure by our Calling.

Secondly, I deny, that any of those that are Effectually called, shall fall short of Salvation, *John 6. It's the Will of God, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have Everlasting Life*, John 3. 16. *God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believed on him should not perish, but have Everlasting Life.*

Thirdly, A good Conscience is not always to be understood of a renewed Conscience, *Acts* 23. *Paul* declares, *That he had lived in all good Conscience before God to that day*; he had been morally Just, and Honest, as well before his Conversion as after; he walked very exact as to the Letter of the Law; *touching the Law* (he himself saith) that *he was blameless*.

Secondly, You say, if it were not possible for a righteous Man to fall away and perish, the Prophet would not have supposed it, as he doth *Ezek.* 18. 26. and 33. 12.

Reply. I know not what ground you have to think, that the Prophet did suppose any such thing, nor what advantage you will make of such instances; either the righteous here are such as are really righteous, or they are not; if they are, they shall not turn from it, they are secured by the Promises of this Covenant, *Psal.* 92. 12. *The Righteous shall flourish like the Palm-tree, they shall grow as the Cedar in Lebanon; they that be planted in the House of the Lord, they shall be fat and flourishing, they shall still bring forth fruit in Old Age, to shew that the Lord is upright, and that there is no unrighteousness in him.* The Righteousness of God stands engaged to keep the righ-

teous in a flouriſhing and a perſevering State, *Pſalm* 37. 30, 31, and 37. I think it's a good rule not to make that the Senſe of one Text which is in it ſelf dark, that contradicts others that are clear; but if the righteous here are not really ſuch, then it makes nothing for you whether they ſtand or fall.

Thirdly, You ſay, that there are many Cautions given to the faithful in Scripture, to take heed leſt they ſhould fall away, and many Threats are denounced againſt them in Caſe they do.

Reply. All this I readily grant, and therefore ſhall not recite the Scriptures that you offer to prove it: I believe theſe Cautions and Threats, to which I may add Promiſes too, that are made to thoſe that perſevere, are all good means to prevent falling away, and given to that end.

Fourthly, You Query, Whether theſe Scriptures where theſe Cautions and Threats are, do not prove that the righteous may fall away?

Reply. Firſt, I deny that total and final backſliding, where the Soul is truly gracious, is aſſerted by any of theſe Scriptures, either expreſly, or implicitly.

Secondly, I would Query, Whether there be not ſome of the Elect of God among thoſe faithful ones that are thus warned to take heed, and threatned in Caſe they fall away? you grant, *Page* 21. that the Elect are in time called, and juſtified, and ſhall not fall away from God, but ſhall ſurely be ſaved; are not theſe caution'd as well as others, and threatned in Caſe they fall away as well as others? Does the Scripture make any Diſtinction in this Caſe?

Fifthly, You Query, To what end Cautions and Warnings are given to the Righteous, if there be no falling away, or Threatnings in Caſe they do, when there is no ſuch thing?

Reply. Firſt, It is to this end, that the Righteous ſhould

ſhould be more watchful, and careful, and labour to keep cloſe to God in a backſliding-time, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. the Lord Works by means.

Secondly, I would Query, To what end all theſe Cautions and Threats are given to the Elect, as well as others, of whom you ſay they ſhall certainly perſevere? And now I ſhall endeavour to prove, that a ſanctified Soul, one that is born of God, one that is a true Believer, is in ſuch a ſecure State that he ſhall not fall away.

Firſt, He is ſecured by Acts of Grace without him.

Secondly, By Principles of Grace infuſed into him.

Thirdly, By Acts of Grace exerted by him.

Fourthly, By Gracious Promiſes given to him.

Fifthly, By the Prayer of Chriſt for him.

Firſt, A Believer is ſecured by Acts of Grace without him: And here are four Acts of Grace that I ſhall mention:

Firſt, Every Believer is an Elect Perſon: We may go by the Streams to the Fountain, we may argue from the Effect to the Cauſe; Faith is that we are elected to, 1 *Pet.* 1. 2. *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, unto the Obedience of the Blood of ſprinkling:* What is that but Faith? whereby in Obedience to the Will of God we apply the Blood of Chriſt. The Apoſtle had no other ground to ſtile them Elect in the firſt Epiſtle, than he had to ſtile them Believers in the ſecond; they were ſuch as had obtained like precious Faith, which is called, *Tit.* 1. 1. *The Faith of Gods Elect*; it being peculiar unto them. The Elect obtained this Faith, as well as other Bleſſings of the New Covenant, *Rom.* 11. 7. *And the reſt were blinded:* It was upon their Believing that the Apoſtle concluded the *Theſſalonians the Elect of God*, 1 Epiſt. 1. 4. That there is Security by this Act of Grace is granted by your ſelf, *Page* 21. fr-

from *Rom.* 8. 30. that the Elect ſhall not fall away, but ſhall certainly obtain Salvation.

Secondly, Every Believer is a Child of God, *Gal.* 3. 26. *Ye are all the Children of God by Faith in Jeſus Chriſt*, John 1. 12. *To as many as believed on him, to them he gave Power to become the Sons of God.*

Secondly, Thoſe that are once the Children of God, are for ever his Children: *The Servant abideth not in the Houſe for ever, but the Son abideth ever*, John 8. 35. Wherefore thou art no more a Servant, but a Son. *Gal.* 4. 5. 1 *John* 3. 2. *Beloved, now are we the Sons of God; but it does not appear what we ſhall be, but when he ſhall appear, we ſhall be like him, for we ſhall ſee him as he is.* Thoſe that are at preſent the Children of God, ſhall be greatly advanced when Chriſt ſhall come; they are at preſent *Heirs of God, and joynt Heirs with Chriſt*, and then they ſhall be put into the full enjoyment of him, *John* 14. 2, 3.

Thirdly, Every Believer is one with Jeſus Chriſt, and once united to Chriſt and for ever. *Firſt*, Every Believer is one with Jeſus Chriſt; this appears in that Faith is the Fruit of the Vine, the Believer is the Branch: Chriſt is the Vine, the Branch can't bear this Fruit of it ſelf, unleſs it be in the Vine; *Without me you can do nothing*, ſaith Chriſt, *or ſevered from me*, ſo the Margent reads it, *John* 15. 5. Though Union with Chriſt, antecedent unto Faith, be denied by ſome, I know none that do deny Believers to be one with Chriſt. *Secondly*, Once in Chriſt and for ever; *A Bone of him ſhall not be broken*; not only of his natural Body, but of his Myſtical Body alſo, *John* 6. 38. *I came down from Heaven, not to do my own Will, but the Will of him that ſent me, and this is the Will of him that ſent me, that of all that he hath given me I ſhould looſe nothing.*

Fourthly,

Fourthly, Every Believer is justified; *Acts* 13.39. *By him all that believe are justified from all things, which they could not be justified from by the Law of Moses:* Justification consists of two parts, there is a discharge from Guilt, and a Title to Life and Glory; both these are the priviledges of Believers.

First, A Discharge from Guilt, and that from all, past, present, and to come, *Heb.* 10. 14. *By one offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified:* That a Believer is sanctified, none can deny; take sanctification for a separation, or take it properly, that perfection here is to be understood of the pardon of sin, is granted by your self, and the word for ever shews that it is all sin, past, present, and to come, so that here is nothing left to damn. God damns none but for sin, nor will he damn any whose sins are all pardoned.

Secondly, Justification consists in a Title to Life and Glory, *Rom.* 5. 18. and this is a Believers priviledge too, *John* 3. 16. *Whosoever believeth shall not perish, but have everlasting life.*

Secondly, A Believer is secured by principles of Grace infused into him, 1 *John* 3. 9. *He that is born of God doth not commit sin, neither can he, because he is born of God, his seed remaineth in him:* The seed of Grace is of an immortal nature, it never dies away, *John* 4. 14. *Whosoever shall drink of the Water that I shall give him, it shall be in him a well of water springing up to everlasting life, and he shall never thirst*; that is, he shall never dye for thirst, for there is a well of water in him, and it's a springing well, and shall remain so, till the Soul is made perfectly happy.

Thirdly, Every Believer is secured by acts of Grace exerted by him; there is not one Believer but is built upon a rock, he bottoms on Christ, or he is not a Believer; and being founded there, he is secure: *Upon this*

this rock will I build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, Mat. 16. *The House that was built upon a rock stood; when the wind blew, and the floods arose, and the rain fell, the house fell not, for it was founded upon a rock:* Christ hath promised that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it, and if all the powers of Hell can't remove him from the rock, what can? a Believer hath taken hold of him *who is that anchor within the vail, both sure and stedfast*, Heb. 6. 19. A Believer lies at Anchor as it were, and there he is secure; whatever storm may come, he shall never make shipwrack of Faith and a good Conscience. But you will say, may not the Cable break, Faith be lost, and the Soul shipwrackt at last? I answer, no, there is a double Cable, as the Soul apprehends Christ by Faith, so Christ apprehends or comprehends the Soul by his spirit, *Phil.* 3. 12. Christ will not let go the Soul, and so long the Soul cannot let go Jesus Christ, *He is kept by the power of God through faith to Salvation*, 1 Pet. 1. 5. God does not keep the Soul that keeps it self in the faith, but he keeps the Soul of a Believer through faith; so that he shall certainly *Receive the end of his faith, even the salvation of his Soul*, verse 9.

Fourthly, A Believer is secured by gracious promises given to him: *To us are given exceeding great and precious promises*, 2 Pet. 1. 4. Now the promises that are given to a Believer I shall rank under three Heads: *First*, Promises of Security against Sin and Satan. *Secondly*, Of perseverance in Grace here: And, *Thirdly*, Of Glory hereafter.

First, He hath the promise of security against sin, *Rom.* 6. 14. *Sin shall not have dominion over you, for you are not under the Law but under Grace:* Not under the Law as a Covenant of Works, but under Grace, or the Covenant of Grace; sin may rage, but it shall not reign; it may assault,

assault, but it shall not overcome; it may captivate, but it shall not subject; it may wound, but it shall not kill; the power of sin is broke, (that is, the killing power) in our deliverance from the Law: *The strength of sin is the Law*; but a Believer hath victory over it through Christ.

Secondly, He hath the promise of security from Satan, *Mat.* 16. 18. *Upon this Rock will I build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.*

Secondly, A Believer has promises of perseverance here, *Jer.* 17. 7, 8. *Blessed is the man who trusteth in thee, and whose hope the Lord is: He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that sendeth forth his roots by the streams, he shall not know when heat cometh, neither be careful in the year of drought, his leaf shall be green, and he shall not cease to yield his fruit:* Psal. 125. 1. *They that trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Sion, that never can be removed: As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so is the Lord round about them that fear him, from henceforth even for ever. He that cometh unto me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst,* Joh 6. 35. He shall never dye for hunger, nor for thirst: *My sheep hear my voice, and they follow me, and I give to them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hands; my Father that gave them me is greater than all, and none shall pluck them out of my fathers hands,* John 10. 27. These promises, and many more that I could offer, are all absolute, and every Believer has an interest in them.

Thirdly, A Believer has promises of Glory hereafter, *John* 3. 16. *That whosoever believeth should not perish, but have everlasting life:* Mark 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved:* John 6. 40. *And this is my Fathers will, that whoso seeth the Son, and believeth on him, should have everlasting life.*

Fourthly, Believers have security by the Prayer of Christ

Christ for them, *John* 17. He prayed for them that did believe, and them that should believe. *First*, That God would keep them in the World, from the evil of the World. *Secondly*, That they might be with him where he is, to behold his Glory. Christ never prayed but God heard him, *John* 11. 42. *And I know that thou heareſt me always.* I hope by all this I have put the buſineſs of the perſeverance of every true Believer beyond diſpute, and have hereby ſtrengthened my Arguments to prove that the Covenant of Grace cannot be broken by the Subjects thereof.

Fifthly, You ſay, you brought *John* 3. 36. 2 *Theſ.* 1. 8, 9. *Heb.* 2. 2, 3. *Heb.* 10. 28, 29. to prove that the Covenant of Grace might be broken, and that it threatens a curſe for the breach of it.

Reply. The firſt three of theſe Texts ſpeaks of final Unbelievers, theſe I deny to be the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace; *They were none of Chriſt's ſheep, for if they had, they ſhould have heard Chriſts voice, and have followed him*, John 10. 27, 28. *And if they were none of Chriſts, they were none of Abrahams ſeed, and ſo not heirs according to the promiſe.*

Sixthly, You ſay, I ask you how theſe can be lookt on as the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace, that ſhall be condemned for diſobeying the Goſpel? And you may ask me again, how they ſhall be condemned for diſobeying the Goſpel that are no ways under it?

Reply. I do not know, neither do I believe that ſuch as never heard of the Goſpel ſhall be condemned for the breach of it; but it's one thing to be under the commands of the Goſpel, and another thing to be intereſted in the Covenant of Grace. Such as are none of Chriſt's may be under Goſpel-Laws, but there are none but Chriſt's that have an intereſt in that Covenant, *Gal.* 3. 29. You ſay your ſelf, Book the Second, *page* 17. that the *Jews* were Aliens as well as others, till they believ-

believed, and yet they were certainly under Gospel-Laws before they did believe, *Acts* 2. 38. The *Pagans* also were under Gospel-Commands, when the Gospel was preached to them, though they never did embrace it; and will you say that such as never embrace the Gospel had an interest in the Covenant of Grace?

Seventhly, You query, How they may have Salvation offered to them by the Gospel-Covenant, that have no interest in the Gospel-Covenant?

Reply. Here again I must tell you, it's one thing to have Salvation offered, and another thing to have an interest in the Covenant. What I have already said concerning the Precepts, I may here say concerning the Promises, the *Jews* that did not embrace the Word, had the offer as well as those that did, *Acts* 2. 39. And yet it's acknowledged by your self, that they were aliens as well as others, and not to be lookt on as interested in the Covenant of Grace, till they did believe, and so were the *Pagans* to whom the Gospel was preached, and yet they had the offer of the promise as well as others, and in the offer of the promise there is the offer of Salvation.

Again, You tell me, *page* 60. That the promise was offered to the *Jews*, but they had no actual right to it, till they believed and were converted; and what now must a person be lookt on as having an interest in the Covenant, that has no actual right to the promise?

Eightly, You say, my Reply to *Heb.* 10. 2. 8. 29. is, that such as were said to be sanctified by the blood of the Covenant, were such as were so in appearance only, and not really such; this Answer you say doth not agree with the Text; where are Hypocrites or bare Professors said to be sanctified by the blood of Christ?

Reply. I have told you already, and you took no notice of it, why would you know it again? I told you the

the Churches were frequently ſtyled Saints, though there were Hypocrites among them, and I do not know upon what ground they were ſo ſtyled, nor yet upon what ground any may be ſo ſtyled, but upon their profeſſion; we cannot judge the Hearts of any; the Apoſtles ſtyled the Churches Saints, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *To them that are ſanctified in Chriſt Jeſus, called to be Saints*; this was in the judgment of Charity, not in the judgment of Infallibility.

Secondly, You ſay, this Text will agree well enough with that in *Phil.* 1. 6. and that it's true, *That God that hath begun a good work in us will not ceaſe to perfect it*; provided we perſevere to make a good uſe of his Grace; and it's as true, if we neglect our duty, and abuſe his Grace, we may fall from our ſanctified State.

Reply. Theſe Proviſo's are not in the Text, they are put in by your ſelf, nor can you give me one Text to prove them; and as for the perſeverance of the Saints, I have ſufficiently proved it already, and need ſay no more.

Ninthly, You ſay, if formal Profeſſors may tranſgreſs the Commands of the Goſpel, then they muſt needs be under the preceptive part of the Covenant of Grace, for the Commands of the Goſpel are a part thereof as well as the Promiſes.

Reply. Firſt, If ſuch as are under Goſpel-Precepts are ſubjects of the Covenant of Grace, then (as I ſaid before) *Jews* and *Pagans* to whom the Goſpel was preached (though they never came to make a profeſſion thereof) were the ſubjects of the Covenant, and this your own principles will not allow.

Secondly, If Goſpel-Precepts be a part of the Covenant of Grace, why did you leave them out in the deſcription you gave of the Covenant, *page* 30. *I will be merciful to their unrighteouſneſs, and their ſins and iniquities will*

will I remember no more: This (you say) is the substance of the Covenant of Grace; here are no Precepts, therefore it seems they are no part of the substance of the Covenant.

Thirdly, I would query, How it appears that Gospel Precepts are a part of the Covenant as well as the Promises? You do not find any of them mentioned, where the Covenant is most clearly treated of, as *Gen.* 17. 7. *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. nor any where else, nor have you offered any Scripture to prove it.

Fourthly, I deny that any have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, that have no interest in the Promises.

Fifthly, I will give you my thoughts of the Covenant of Grace, and then leave you to judge of it: It's a mutual compact between the Father and the Son, for the Redemption and Salvation of a certain number of Mankind, wherein Christ hath engaged to perform such Conditions as the Father proposed, and the Father again engaged himself by many promises on his part, some of which were peculiar to the Son, others made to the Son for those for whom the Son undertook, the latter of which were all free, with respect to the subjects, upon which account it's called the Covenant of Grace, and I doubt not to prove every part of this description, if necessity required it.

Tenthly, You say, that while God waited for Mens Conversion, and allowed them sufficient Grace, they were in a Capacity to repent, and if they had truly repented, they should have obtained mercy, and consequently then they had an interest in the Covenant of Grace.

Reply. I do not know what you mean by this allowance of Grace to capacitate men to repent: If you mean the first degree of Grace, or that which is called the habit, or principle of Grace, which is infused in the work of Regeneration, which alone can make men capable

of Repentance, I grant, that such have an interest in the Covenant of Grace: True Repentance is a fruit of interest, not the cause; but what is this to those that live and dye impenitently, whatever Gospel-means they live under?

Eleventkly, You say, that if it be granted to me, that none but such as are born of God, are the subjects of the Covenant of Grace, then I will prove, that such as are born of God can't possibly fall away, and yet the Text that I alledge will hardly do it.

Reply. First, I desire no such grant of you, nor will I accept it; I say that all the elect of God are the subjects thereof, and their new-birth is a fruit of their interest, they are born by promise, *Gal.* 4. 28. *We Brethren, as Isaac was, are the Children of the Promise.*

Secondly, If I prove, that those that are born of God can't fall away, though it be with hardship, yet if it be done, it's well enough. You confess, that the Text I bring, 1 *John* 3. 9. proves that a regenerate man, whilst he remains so, will not commit wilful deliberate sins, or allow himself in a course of sin, because such sinning is irreconcilable with a regenerate state.

Reply. I thank you for allowing my Exposition thus far, and I hope you will allow it farther, yet, I suppose you will grant me this also, that sins not allowed will not cause him to degenerate again; for if they should, then none would remain in a regenerate state, because there is no man living that sinneth not, though not with the full consent of the will, *Rom.* 7. *If I do that which I allow not, then I consent to the Law, that it is good: So that it's no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.*

But you say, this Text doth argue an impossibility for a regenerate man to commit deliberate sins.

Reply. First, I hope it's impossible for him to commit deliberate sins while he remains regenerate, this you

you must grant me, or else you are inconsistent with your self; for you confess that such sinning is irreconcilable with a regenerate state, and now give me leave to ask you, how a regenerate man may become degenerate again? —— *First*, Sins of Commission will not destroy his regenerate state, for he can't allow himself in such sins, and sins not allowed of cannot do it. *Secondly*, The World neither by its frowns nor by its flatteries can do it; *For he that is born of God overcometh the World*, 1 John 5. 4. *Thirdly*, The Devil can't do it, *For he that is born of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not*, 1 John 5. 18. It remains then, that nothing but sins of omission can cause a regenerate man to become degenerate; and here again, they must be deliberate, wilful neglects of known Gospel-duties; for if the bear omission of duty through Weakness and Infirmity, for want of Light and Knowledge, or from a sudden gust of Temptation, should cause a regenerate man to become degenerate, none would remain in a regenerate state, for there are Omissions in the best as well as Commissions. For, *First*, His seed remaineth in him, the Principles of Grace that are infused in the Work of Regeration are of an immortal nature; this seed remaining in him, he cannot sin either by omission or commission, that is, with full consent and allowance. *Secondly*, Where there is Life there will be motion, some breathing, tho' weak breathing; *John* 4. 14. *But whoso drinketh of the water that I shall give him, it shall be in him a well of Water, springing up to everlasting life*. *Thirdly*, Such have the Spirit of God sent forth into their Hearts, *Gal.* 4. 5. *Because ye are Sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father*; the Spirit puts the Soul upon duty, and helps in duty; *We know not what to pray for as we ought, but the spirit helpeth our infirmities*, Rom. 8. the Spirit of God causeth the Soul to walk in his statutes,

and to observe his judgments, and do them. *Fourthly*, When God hath sent forth the Spirit into the heart, it shall remain there, *John* 14. 15. *And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the spirit of truth, whom the World cannot receive, because it knoweth him not; but ye know him, for he shall be in you, and abide with you:* By all this it appears, that a person once regenerate is for ever regenerate. The other Scripture, *John* 10. 28. that I brought to prove that a regenerate soul can't fall away again, you say, doth evidently suppose our compliance with his Grace.

Reply. Hath Christ undertaken to make us compliant, or hath he not? if not, then are we under an impossibility, for we can neither will nor do of our selves; Christ hath said, *Without me ye can do nothing*, John 15. 5. If he hath, then are we still in a safe state; and that he hath is evident, *Psal.* 110. 3. *Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power.*

Secondly, Christ hath here promised to give them eternal life, that they shall never perish; this is enough to prove their persevering state: If they shall come safe to the end of their way, then shall they hold out in their way to the end; *It's he that endures to the end shall be saved*; but these shall be saved, therefore they shall endure to the end.

Thirdly, Christ hath promised, that no man shall ever pluck them out of his hands; he hath assured us, that his Father is greater than all, and that none shall ever be able to pluck them out of his Father's hand; neither Men, nor Devils, shall ever be able to pluck them thence; the power of God is engaged to keep them, and that power must needs be sufficient, for it's omnipotent, *Rom.* 14. 4. *Who art thou that judgest another mans servant, to his own master he standeth or falleth, yea, he shall be upheld, for God is able to make him stand:* The Apostle

Apostle could not argue barely from the power of God, that he should be upheld, (though his power is omnipotent) unless it were engaged to uphold.

Secondly, You say, that God doth enable us to persevere with such a power as is able to perswade, but doth not necessitate us to be good.

Reply. First, If this power be able to perswade, it's well enough, then we shall be good, if we are not, this power is not able to perswade us.

Secondly, Though God does not necessitate us to be good whether we will or no, yet the will being changed, and the Soul principled unto good, the Actions will be good, *Mat.* 12. 35. *A good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth good things:* And such are the subjects of this promise.

Thirdly, You say, the great Question is, Whether we may not through our own default separate our selves from Jesus Christ?

Reply. Though you call this the great Question, yet it seems to me there is no room for such a question in the Text; is not the power of the Son, and of the Father, that stands engaged to keep us, sufficient to prevent such a Departure from Christ?

Secondly, If it be the will of the Father that of all those that he hath given him he should loose nothing, then we can't separate our selves from Christ; *But it is the will of the Father, that of all that he hath given him he should loose nothing*; therefore we can't separate our selves from Christ. If sheep be lost, it's the same thing to the owner of them, whether it be by taking away, or straying away, will the Shepherd be less blameless if the sheep stray away and be lost, then he would be if they were stolen away? I wonder what kind of Shepherd you would make of Jesus Christ, that has a charge from the Father to keep his sheep, so that none of them be lost, and yet that he should take no more care, but

ſuffer them to ſtray away and periſh, to get out of his hands and be gone, when he muſt needs ſee the going of them. Was Chriſt ſo tender as to come down from Heaven to Earth to ſeek them out, when they had loſt themſelves? Was he ſo ready to do the will of his Father, *That he came down from Heaven not to do his own will, but the will of him that ſent him*, and will he now regard them no more, nor the will of the Father any more, but ſuffer them to wander, to ſtray away, and be loſt again? How will the Lord take this at the hands of Chriſt? Will he not require his flock at the hands of his ſhepherd? See what the Lord ſaith to the Shepherds, *Ezek.* 34. 4. he brings a charge againſt them, *Becauſe they had not brought again that which was driven away, nor ſought out that which was loſt*, verſe 10. He tells them plainly, he will require the flock at their hands: He who was ſo faithful to his Engagement as to bring them into his fold, will not be leſs faithful to keep them there when brought in. And this may be ſaid alſo for the ſheep, that when once they know their Shepherds voice, *They will follow him; a ſtranger they will not follow, for they know not the voice of a ſtranger*, John 10. I gave you 1 *John* 2. 19. alſo to prove that ſuch as do fall finally and totally are none of Chriſt's; *They are gone out from us, but they were not all of us; if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us*; their total and final Apoſtacy *made it manifeſt that they were not all of us:* But who were they, if they were not of us?

I Anſwer, the Sons of *Hagar*, not of *Sarah*; the Sons of the Bond-woman, not of the Free. There are but theſe two that are Mothers of Children, and the Apoſtle tells us, *Gal.* 4. 24. *That theſe things are an allegory, and hold forth the two Covenants*; that is, the Covenant of Works and the Covenant of Grace. Final Apoſtates then are not the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace; that

that Covenant secures the Subjects thereof, that they shall not depart from God, *Jer.* 32. 40. but this you pass'd without a reply; so that my Argument stands good, that the Covenant of Grace cannot be broken by the subjects thereof, and that it's a good note to distinguish it from that Covenant into which the Natural Seed were taken, considered as such, which was a Covenant that might be broken, *Gen.* 17. 14. and which was broken by the Subjects thereof, *Jer.* 31. 32.

SECT. VII.

THE Second Difference you say I make between these two Covenants is this, that Covenant into which the *Jews* entred with their seed was conditional, the Covenant of Grace is absolute; and whereas you proved that the Covenant of Grace is conditional, I make several exceptions against it. You say my first Exception is this, if it be a free Covenant, then it is not conditional; if it be conditional, then it it not free; if it be of Grace, then it is not of Works, otherwise Grace is no more Grace; if it be of Works, then it is not of Grace, otherwise Work is no more Work; that unless the nature of these two are changed, they can't stand together in the business of Salvation; it's the nature of Grace to give freely, and the nature of Works to receive as a Debt; that is, when Works are performed as Conditions. To this you say, that Works absolutely perfect, or done with a conceit of merit, are inconsistent with Grace.

Reply. The Apostle makes no such distinction of Works, but shews the inconsistency of Works and Grace in point of Justification, and that is the point that is contended about in this Epistle, granted by your self; now the Apostle doth here disclaim works under any consideration whatsoever, as having no hand in it,

or as being a condition thereof, the performance of which entitling thereunto; so that there is no bringing in of Works, but by excluding of Grace.

Secondly, You say, the condition of Gospel-Obedience doth not infringe the Free-grace of God, for it was an act of Free-grace to make Faith and Imperfect Obedience the condition of Justification and Salvation, and to accept and save on such conditions.

Reply. First, That which you here call conditions, as Faith, and Imperfect Obedience, (by which I suppose you mean sincere Obedience) are themselves some of the Blessings of this Covenant, the fruit of Interest, and not the conditions. Faith is that which the righteousness of Christ (which is that righteousness by which we are justified) entitles us to, and not that that entitles us to that righteousness, 2 *Pet.* 1. 2. *To you that have obtained like precious faith with us, through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ.*

Secondly, I deny that Faith and Imperfect Obedience are the conditions of Justification and Salvation, or that either of these are bestowed on the subjects of this Covenant or Condition; this I shall clear when I come to speak more particularly to it.

Thirdly, I deny that to be a free gift that is bestow'd on conditions.

Thirdly, You say, that good works arising from Faith in Christ, and done without a conceit of Merit, consists very well with Free-grace.

Reply. First, I grant it in point of Sanctification, but I deny it in point of Justification, and that's the point that's in debate; if it be of Works, then it's no more of Grace, therefore Works and Grace are not consistent.

Secondly, I would ask, Whence Faith in Christ does rise? whether that be not the Free-gift of God?

Fourthly, You say, that it will hardly consist with the Wis-

Wisdom and Dominion of God over Men, to relinquish his Right to their Service, and to part with his chiefest Blessings, without requiring any Condition of them.

Reply. First, I grant, that it's inconsistent both with his Wisdom, and Dominion over Men, to relinquish his Right to their Service; and I should as much contend for his Sovereignty, if opposed, as now I do for the freeness of his Grace and Mercy.

Secondly, I would Query, Why it may not consist with his Wisdom, and Dominion over Men, to part with his chiefest Blessings without a Condition, as well as his lesser? Sure I am, it will stand with his Grace and Mercy very well, and the greater the Blessing is that is freely bestowed, the more free Grace shines out in the bestowing of it, and the advancing of one Attribute does not interfere with another. You grant, that some of the Blessings are freely bestowed, as the first degree of Grace, *&c.* and if so, then a free Gift is not inconsistent with his Wisdom and Dominion; and why may not the bestowing of Justification, and Glorification, be as consistent as the bestowing of Grace?

Thirdly, He hath given Jesus Christ freely, without any Condition, 1 *John* 4. 10. *Herein is Love, not that we loved him, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the Propitiation for our Sins:* He parted with Jesus Christ freely, this consisted with his Wisdom and Dominion, and I do not know a greater Blessing that the God of Heaven had to bestow, nor any thing that he can withhold, where he hath bestowed this: *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?* Rom. 8. 32. God does not set his Grace to Sale; what he gives, he gives freely.

You say, my next Exception is this, that a Covenant doth not always imply a mutual Obligation, there may be a Covenant made without it, as the Covenant made

with

with all Flesh, *Gen.* 9. that he would drown the World no more, that required no Condition.

This you say is not a Covenant, but an absolute Promise.

Reply. First, The Lord calls it a Covenant, and he knew what Name to give it as well as you; and I think it very proper for us to call that a Covenant that God hath so named.

Secondly, If this may be called an absolute Promise, then the Covenant of Grace may be called an absolute Promise too, and then I think you will not deny it to be a free Covenant. I have more ground in Scripture to call that an absolute Promise with respect to the subjects thereof, than you have to call this so; for the Scripture does often call that a Promise, *Acts* 2. 39. *The Promise is to you*; that is, the Covenant of Grace; *Gal.* 3. 17. *And this I say, that the Covenant which was confirmed before of God in Christ, the Law which was four hundred and thirty Years after could not disanul, that it should make the Promise of none effect:* Here the Covenant and the Promise is the same thing, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise*; that is, *according to the Covenant*; but where can you give me one Instance in Scripture, that the Covenant made with all Flesh is called a Promise.

Secondly, I gave you another Instance of the Covenant that was between *Jacob* and *Laban*, in behalf of *Laban*'s Daughters, that were the subjects thereof, and desired you to shew me what Condition was required of them, but you could pass it without a Reply.

Secondly, You say, that there is one strange thing which I assert, and that is, that the Covenant of Grace was made between the Father and the Son, for, and in behalf of the Elect, for which I bring *Isa.* 49. from 1, to 9. You say indeed, that here is mention made of Gods purpose to call in the *Gentiles* as well as the *Jews*, into

into his Church, and that God would send Jesus Christ to do this, but here is no mention that the Covenant of Grace was made between the Father and the Son.

Reply. Though there be no mention made in expres's terms, yet here is enough expres'd to give us ground to conclude, that the Covenant of Grace was made between the Father and the Son; here is not only a purpose, but here is a mutual compact, *verse* 4, 5, 6. in which the Lord propoſeth the loſt Sheep of the Houſe of *Iſrael.* In the firſt place, here is ſomething that Chriſt muſt do for them as well as for the *Gentiles*, therefore his Work was not barely to bring the *Gentiles* into the Church; *Thou art my Servant*, (that is Chriſt) *Iſrael, in whom I will be glorified*; *then I ſaid*, (that is, the Son) *I have ſpent my Strength for nought, I have laboured in vain, yet ſurely my Judgment is with the Lord, and my Work with my God:* Chriſt accepts of the firſt Propoſal, *To be God's Servant, to raiſe up the Tribes of Jacob*; here is not a Word of the *Gentiles* yet, and now the Father anſwers again, *verſe* 5. *And now ſaith the Lord that formed me from the Womb to be his Servant, to bring Jacob again to him, though Iſrael be not gathered, yet ſhall it be glorious in the Eyes of the Lord, and my God ſhall be my ſtrength*; yet he ſpeaks of *Iſrael*, and the gathering here is not into a Church-ſtate, but ſome greater Work; and the Father goes on farther, *verſe* 6. *It is indeed a light thing that thou ſhouldeſt be my Servant, to raiſe up the Tribes of Jacob, and to reſtore the preſerved of Iſrael*; *I will alſo give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou may'ſt be my Salvation unto the ends of the Earth.* Here is firſt a Compact between the Father and the Son, which you ſay is the Nature of a Covenant; in this Compact Chriſt undertakes to be a Redeemer, *To raiſe up the Tribes of Jacob, and to reſtore the preſerved of Iſrael:* This could not be done but by a Price paid, and though *Iſrael*, that were firſt propoſed, were too few for ſo great an undertaking,

king, yet Christ sticks not at that, he consents to the first Proposal.

Secondly, Here is Salvation promised upon Christs undertaking, and that to *the ends of the Earth*. You grant your self, that none shall be saved, but the Elect or faithful persevering Christians, therefore this Salvation promised must be restricted to a peculiar People; if there had been no Covenant struck up between the Father and the Son, what should the meaning of that be, *Psalm* 89. 28. *My Covenant shall stand fast with him for evermore?* how could the Covenant of Grace be called Christ's Covenant, as it is *Zech.* 9. 11. if he had not been a party Covenanting? *As for thee; by the Blood of thy Covenant have I sent forth thy Prisoners out of the Pit, wherein there was no Water.*

Thirdly, Here is a Promise made to Christ with respect to himself; a Promise that the Lord would stand by him, *verse* 8. *In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in the day of Salvation have I holpen thee:* This Christ bottomed upon, *Isa.* 50. 7. *The Lord God will help me*; and this Promise was made good when Christ was offered up, 2 *Cor.* 6. 2. And whereas you say, that here is a purpose mentioned, that God will send Christ to gather the *Gentiles* into his Church, as well as the *Jews*, it's quite another thing; it's a mutual Compact between the Father and the Son, wherein the Son undertakes to be a Redeemer both of *Jew* and *Gentile*, and the Father promised Salvation upon that undertaking: I gave you likewise for the proof of this, that the Covenant was made between the Father and the Son, *Tit.* 1. 2. *In hopes of Eternal Life, which God that cannot lye promised before the World was.* Eternal Life is a comprehensive of all good, Grace here, and Glory hereafter: I queried, To whom was this Promise made, if not to Christ? and for whom, if not for the Elect? and, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Who hath saved, and called us, not according*

to

to our Works, but according to his own Purpose and Grace, which was given to us in Christ before the World was: But neither of these have you made Reply to.

You Query, Whether this Covenant was made with Christ? *I will be merciful to their Unrighteousness, and their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more.*

Reply. First, We are not to understand here, by making the Covenant, that first transact that was between the Father and the Son; for the time to which the Apostle here refers was the time when Christ was offered up, as appears *Heb.* 10. 14, 15. The Apostle quotes this very Text out of *Jer.* 31. 34. to prove, *That by one Oblation Christ had for ever perfected them that are sanctified*, and brings in the Holy Ghost to witness the Truth of this.

Secondly, The Word that is translated *make*, *ver.* 8. signifies to *Consummate*; *Behold the Day is come, saith the Lord, that I will Consummate a new Covenant with the House of Israel*; this Consummation was by the Blood of Christ.

Thirdly, That here is a Promise of the pardon of Sin, hinders not but that this same Covenant was made with Christ, though he had no Sin to pardon; for the Promise respects the subjects of the Covenant, and not Christ as a party Covenanting.

You Query, Whether Christ had Sins to be pardoned, or a hard Heart to be cured?

Reply. He had not, but we for whom this Covenant was made with Christ had both. —— Again, you ask, Whether God was merciful to Christ concerning the debt he paid? I Answer, No; he had to do with Justice, he paid the utmost farthing; but according to your Doctrine, many of those for whom the debt was paid, must lie in Hell for the same debt, Justice not discharging them on Christs satisfaction. And now give me leave to ask, If Christ were not a party Covenanting,

nanting, why he must die to confirm the Covenant? The Apostle tells us, *Heb.* 8. it must be the Death of the Testator that must confirm the Testament. Either the Covenant of Grace was confirmed by the Death of Christ, or it was not; if it was, then was he a party Covenanting; if it were not, then is the Covenant of Grace of no force; for a Testament is not of force till Men be dead.

Secondly, You say, the chief thing that I insist upon, to prove that the Covenant of Grace is not Conditional, is this, that God freely calleth us, and enlighteneth our Minds, and changeth our Wills, and affordeth us sufficient Grace to enable us to do what he requires, without any Condition pre-required of us; for we cannot perform any Duty till these Blessings are given out to us, therefore Faith and Obedience that are not antecedent to these Blessings, are not the Conditions thereof. To this you Answer, that the Mercies that God promiseth on his part in the New Covenant, are partly absolute, and partly conditional; they are of two sorts; the Mercies that are absolutely promised, are the calling of us to Holiness, the giving us the first degree of Grace, whereby our understandings are inlightened, our Wills reformed, these blessings are freely given us of God, not bestowed on us for any Work of Righteousness wrought by us, according to that of the Apostle, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Who hath saved us and called us, not according to our Works, but according to his own Purpose and Grace, which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the World was.* He hath delivered us out of the Power of Satan, and called us out of our vitious courses unto sanctity; not because we had deserved his favour, but of his free Mercy and Goodness designed us in Christ; for we cannot Will nor do till God calleth us by his Word and Holy Spirit out of an Estate of Sin, and reformeth our Hearts and Wills; and these Blessings

ſings are always ſuppoſed as neceſſary to enable us to do what God requires, in order to obtain higher Mercies.

Reply. Firſt, Free-Will is now out of doors, and I hope that univerſal Redemption and falling from Grace will e're long be out of door with you alſo.

Secondly, I have now gained half the point, that the Covenant of Grace is free and abſolute, with reſpect to the change of the Heart, and I doubt not but I ſhall gain the other part before I have done.

Thirdly, Theſe Bleſſings of the Covenant, that be here granted to be abſolute, are either promiſed to all, or but to a ſelect number. If you ſay, they are promiſed to all, then I would Query, Whether they are beſtowed on all or no? If you ſay they are not, you will then charge God with breach of Promiſe, for the Promiſe you confeſs is abſolute: If you ſay they are, then I would Query, How theſe may be ſaid to be called by his Word and Spirit out of a State of Sin, that never had the Word vouchſafed to them? If you ſay, they are promiſed but to a ſelect number, then are there but a ſelect number that are the ſubjects of this Covenant, no more but ſuch who in time ſhall have their Hearts changed.

Secondly, Theſe to whom theſe Bleſſings are promiſed, are intereſted in the Promiſe, antecedent to the enjoyment of them; they are ſuch, *whoſe Names were written in the Lambs Book of Life, from the Foundation of the World*, Rev. 17. 8.

Secondly, You ſay, that the Mercies that are conditionally promiſed are eſpecially theſe, pardon of Sin, encreaſe of Grace, and eternal Glory; for we muſt repent and forſake Sin in order to obtain Mercy, *Prov.* 28. 13.

Reply. I have ſpoken to that Scripture in *Proverbs* already, and do grant that this muſt be done in order to the ſenſible enjoyment of Mercy, but not in order to

obtain

obtain the Mercy it ſelf, which is the pardon of Sin; and as to the Bleſſings, which you ſay are conditionally promiſed, I ſhall ſpeak to them by and by.

Thirdly, You ſay, we muſt improve Grace, or elſe God will not give us a greater meaſure, but will rather withdraw that which he hath given, *Mat.* 13. 12. *Luke* 3. 18.

Reply. Firſt, I grant, it's the Duty of gracious ones to improve that meaſure of Grace they have received, and that it's the way to enjoy more. Acts of Grace are a means to encreaſe habits.

Secondly, I deny, that it's a Condition entitling them to more, or that God will ever withdraw the Principles of Grace where he hath once given them: The Scriptures that you brought to prove it, do not at all reach the Caſe; that in *Matthew* ſpeaks of a People to whom Chriſt ſpake in Parables, to whom the Knowledge of the Myſtery of the Kingdom of God was never given, *verſe* 11. *To you it is given to know the Myſtery of the Kingdom of God, but to them it is not given*; their Eyes were never ſpiritually enlightened to know the myſtery of the Kingdom of God, which you grant to be a Mercy abſolutely promiſed, and neceſſary to enable us to do the Will of God, *verſe* 13. *They ſeeing, ſee not, and hearing, hear not*; they were meer graceleſs ones, ſuch as the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, 1 *Cor.* 2. *The natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, nor can he know them, for they are ſpiritually diſcerned:* The other Scripture, *Luke* 5. 18. I know not what you brought that for, unleſs it was to help me to Interpret this; *From him that hath not, ſhall be taken away, even that which he ſeemeth to have.* Men may ſeem to be Religious that are not, they may ſeem to be Gracious, that never were really ſo; but where Men are truly Gracious, God doth never, will never withdraw it; for the Gifts and Callings of God are without Repentance;

where

where the Root of the Matter is once planted, there it will remain; *He that is born of God, his Seed abideth in him*, 1 John 3. 9.

Thirdly, You say, if we will enter into Heaven, we must obey the will of our Heavenly Father, *Mat.* 7. 21.

Reply. That Obedience to the Will of God is a Christians Duty, I grant; that it is the way that leads to Life; that Heaven may be lookt on as a Christians Earning, I deny, or that his Duty being performed may be lookt on as a Condition entitling him thereunto.

Fourthly, You say, that these are the prime Blessings of the Covenant of Grace, that follow Faith and sincere Obedience, and are promised only on Conditions; and if I would have spoken to the purpose, I should have proved that there was no Condition required to obtain these special Blessings.

Reply. This Work was not cut out for me in the last; you made no Distinction then between Blessings absolute, and Blessings conditional, as now you have; I shall therefore endeavour to prove, that those you call the chief and prime Blessings of the Covenant of Grace, are as free and absolute as the least.

First, The subjects of this Covenant have a Title to all these Blessings, by vertue of their Relation unto Christ, antecedent to any Condition performed by them; this I shall demonstrate by a few Arguments.

First, If the subjects of this Covenant are Christ's, antecedent to the performance of any Condition, then they have a Title to all these Blessings antecedent thereunto; but the subjects of this Covenant are Christ's, antecedent to the performance of any Condition, therefore they have a Title to these prime Blessings, antecedent thereunto. The Minor is proved by *Psal.* 110. 3. *Thy People before they were a willing People:* John 17. 2. *They were given unto Christ, before Eternal Life was given to them by Christ.* The Major is proved by *Gal.* 3. 29.

If you be Christs, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise. That Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification, are New Covenant Blessings, none will deny; that such as are Christ's have a Title to all New-Covenant Blessings, none can deny.

Secondly, If such as are related to Christ, are blessed with all spiritual Blessings in Christ Jesus, then have they a Title to all these Blessings; but they that are related to Christ, are blest with all spiritual Blessings in Christ, therefore they have a Title to all these, *Eph.* 1. 3. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual Blessings in heavenly places in Christ.* Universals do comprehend specials, Generals do include particulars.

Thirdly, If such as are related unto Christ, have a Title to things present, and things to come too, then have they a Title unto all these Blessings; but such as are related unto Christ, have a Title to things present, and things to come too, therefore they have a right to all these Blessings; 1 *Cor.* 3. 23. *Things present, and things to come, all are yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's.* It's Relation unto Jesus Christ that is the ground of our Title unto all these Blessings, and not any Condition performed by us; we are compleat in him, it is in Christ Jesus *that we have obtained an Inheritance, being predestinated thereunto according to the purpose of him who worketh all things after the Counsel of his own Will*, Eph. 1. 11.

Secondly, I shall prove, that all these blessings are freely bestowed on the subjects of this Covenant, without any Condition performed by them; and here, *First*, I shall prove, that we are freely justified, *Rom.* 3. 24. *Being justified freely by his Grace, through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus.* There are two parts in Justification, there is the Pardon of Sin, and a Title to Life and Glory; and both these are free. *First*, The

The pardon of Sin is free, *Isa.* 43. 25. *I, even I am he that blotteth out thy Transgressions, for my own sake, and will not remember thy Sins.* If you find any Condition here, either required of, or performed by the subjects, antecedent to the blotting out their Sins, pray shew it me: There are a great many things laid to their charge in the preceeding verses, but not one word by way of Commendation, and yet their Sins are blotted out for the Lords sake, *Rom.* 5. 16. *And not as it was by one that sinned, so also is the free Gift, for the offence was by one to Condemnation, but the free Gift is of many offences unto Justification.* For a Gift to be free, and yet conditional, are terms inconsistent, *Eph.* 1. 7. *In whom we have Redemption through his Blood, even the forgiveness of Sin.* One great branch of this Covenant is, *I will be merciful to their unrighteousneß, and their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more.* The accomplishment of which promise was when Christ was offered up, and the evidence of the Spirit in this matter is produced to prove, that Sin is for ever pardoned from the time of Christ's oblation, *Heb.* 10. 14, 15. and that is the reason that Sacrifices have ceas'd ever since, because sin was then remitted; so that the time when Sin was pardoned, was before many of the subjects of this Covenant had a being, before they had actually done either good or evil; and this is sufficient to demonstrate that Sin is freely pardoned: No Condition could be performed before we had a being. You say your self, *Page* 31. that saving and calling *2 Tim.* 1. 9. are absolute, without any work of Righteousness performed by us; now what do you understand by the word *Saved?* it can't be meant of Sanctification, for that is comprehended in Vocation; nor can it be understood of Glorification, for Glorification, though it be not for Works, yet is it according to Works, 2 *Cor.* 5. 10. but saving here is not according to Works, therefore it must necessarily

be meant of Juſtification, and ſo the Word Saved is taken frequently in Scripture, *Eph.* 2. 5. *When we were dead in Treſpaſſes and Sins hath quickned us together with Chriſt.* (*By Grace ye are Saved.*) And this Salvation is free, *Mat.* 1. 22. *He ſhall ſave his People from their Sins.*

Secondly, There is in Juſtification a Title to Life and Glory, and that alſo is free, *Rom.* 5. 18. *By the Righteouſneſs of one the free Gift came upon all Men to the Juſtification of Life.* The Righteouſneſs of Chriſt is freely given to us of God, and that is it that covers our guilt, and entitles us to Life and Happineſs.

Secondly, The increaſe of Grace is freely promiſed, and freely given, *Pſalm* 92. 12. *The Righteous ſhall flouriſh like the Palm-tree, they ſhall grow like the Cedar in Lebanon:* Where is the Condition of this Promiſe? *Iſa.* 40. 29. *He giveth ſtrength to the faint, and to him that has no might he encreaſeth ſtrength.* Phil. 1. *He that hath begun a good work in you will not ceaſe to perfect it, or finiſh it*, as the Margent has it.

Thirdly, Glorification is free, *Rom.* 5. *ult. That as Sin hath reigned unto Death, ſo might Grace reign through Righteouſneſs to Eternal Life, through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* Eternal Life is not called wages, as Death is, *Rom.* 6. *ult. The Wages of Sin is Death, but the Gift of God is Eternal Life through Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.* Luke 12. 32. *It's your Fathers good Pleaſure to give you the Kingdom.* It's the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt that is freely imputed unto us that entitles unto Glory, and not any Condition performed by us, *Rom.* 5. 17. *They that receive abundance of Grace, and of the Gift of Righteouſneſs, ſhall reign in Life by one Jeſus Chriſt.* Rom. 8. *He that ſpared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how ſhall he not with him freely give us all things?* But things given us on Condition are not free; we are aſſured by the Word, that all the parts of our Salvation from firſt to laſt are of the Free Grace of God, *Tit.* 2. 11. *The*

Grace

Grace of God that bringeth Salvation hath appeared unto all Men: In the word *it hath appeared*, there is not one New-Covenant Bleſſing but flows from the free Grace of God, and if it be of Grace, it's no more of Works. I have now proved, that theſe prime Bleſſings of the Covenant, (as you call them) Juſtification, an increaſe of Sanctification, and Glorification, are all as freely promiſed, and as freely beſtowed upon the ſubjects thereof, as the other Bleſſings of the Covenant are; whence I conclude, that I have gained the other part of the Point, and that there are no New-Covenant Bleſſings that hang on Conditions, the performance of which entitles us thereunto, but are all free, and the Covenant it ſelf a free Covenant. You ſay, the next Exception that I make, is againſt your applying 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. to the Covenant of Grace, which I think belongs to the Decree of Election. You ſay, you think that there is good ground to apply it to the Covenant of Grace, and that the Learned Dr. *Hammond* tells you, that it ſignifies a Bill of Compact, and that there is reaſon for it, becauſe there is a Seal ſet to it.

Reply. If I ſhould grant you this, it would make more againſt you than for you; what then can be inferr'd from hence, but that all the Subjects of this Covenant are in a ſure State? They have all the Bleſſings thereof under Hand and Seal, and that Promiſe in particular, *That God will never turn away from them to do them good, and that they ſhall not depart from him:* And that *Hymeneus* and *Philetus* that had apoſtatized and made Shipwrack of Faith, were never in this Bill of Compact, if they had they had not fallen.

Secondly, I ſhall ſet againſt the Learned Dr. the Learned *Calvin*, and *Wilſon*, who do both expound it of the Decree of Election; and whereas you ſay, that there is a Seal to it, which is ſuitable to a Bill of Compact; I Anſwer, that a Seal is ſometimes ſet to con-

ceal, and that seems to be the use of it here; *The Lord knoweth who are his*; they are only known to God, the Elect are not known to others, they are kept close as under a Seal, though it's possible a gracious Soul may know himself to be one of that number; and to prevent security there is a charge given, *Let him that nameth the Name of Christ depart from Iniquity:* And whatever obligation Men lay on themselves by naming the Name of Christ, yet is it the Lord that obligeth them.

Here again you say, I had but little Reason to deny, that there is any Condition implied in those Terms of the Covenant, *Jer.* 31.33.

Reply. Sir, I am for plain dealing, I would not have you shift your Terms; your Words were, that this Text in *Jeremiah*, which I so much insist upon, expresly declares the Conditions of this Covenant, and now it's implied as if there were no difference between expressing and implying.

First, You say, that being granted as I affirm, that the Words are Promissory, and do hold forth the Priviledges of the People of God, yet there are some duties required of them to give them right to the Blessings.

Reply. First, You can't deny the Words to be Promissory; and if you grant them so, then they do not expresly declare the Conditions of this Covenant, as you affirmed they did.

Secondly, Are the Duties (that you say are required of us to give us right to the Blessings) required in this Text that you grant is Promissory, or are they not? if they are, produce them; if not, confess it, and turn me some where else that I may find them.

Secondly, If the performance of Duty does entitle us to the Blessings, then we entitle our selves, and so are more beholding to our selves for our Title than we are to the Promise.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, I would Qnery, What reaſon can be rendered why ſome of the bleſſings in this ſame promiſe be conditional, and others abſolute, when they are all promiſed in one breath as it were, and no Condition is to be found in the Text? the writing the Law of God in our hearts, that we ſhall all know him from the leaſt to the greateſt, theſe bleſſings are abſolutely promiſed, and muſt be beſtowed antecedent to any thing that we can do; and why is not relation to God, and the Pardon of ſin, as abſolutely promiſed as the other? You grant, that ſome of the Bleſſings of this Covenant are abſolutely promiſed, the change of the heart and will, the firſt degree of Grace, and are not theſe the People of God that have ſo much of the Image of God enſtamped upon them? Certainly that was *Cæſar*'s Coin that had *Cæſar*'s Image inſtamp'd upon it: Who were they but the People of God, that had the promiſe of the change of their Wills? *Pſal.* 110. 3. *They were God's people before they were a willing people:* And when the heart and will is changed, they are then manifeſted to be his people. That our Title to theſe bleſſings does not flow from any Condition performed by us, but from our relation to Chriſt, I have already cleared, and therefore ſhall ſay no more to that.

Thirdly, You ſay, we muſt conſent to take the Lord to be our God, before we ſhall have any relation to him.

Reply. This is your great Miſtake: For, *Firſt*, The Lord did own ſome to be his People that had not choſen him to be their God, *Acts* 18. 10. God bids *Paul* to tarry at *Corinth*, the reaſon was, for he had much people there, *Pſal.* 110. 3. *Thy people ſhall be willing in the day of thy power:* They were his people before they were a willing people. *Secondly*, You are now inconſiſtent with your ſelf, (*page* 51.) you ſay, that foreknowledge *Rom.* 8. 29. is God's foreacknowledging them

to be his, and if so, it is to be his people.

Fourthly, You say, God will not own us to be his people, if we walk contrary to his will.

Reply. This is your Mistake again, *Psal.* 89. *If his Children break my Laws, and walk not in my statutes, I will visit their Iniquity with the rod, and their sins with stripes; but my loving kindness will I not take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail; my Covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my mouth.* He owns them in the relation of Children still, and will deal with them as Children, and not as Bastards, he will correct them, but not disinherit them.

Fifthly, You say, you told me in your last, that unless we be obedient to God as his Children, he will not be our God to crown us with happiness.

My Answer to it you say was this, that though Obedience be antecedent to the Crown of Happiness, yet it is not the Condition thereof, because Glory may be considered as an end following means preparing, fitting and disposing, but not as an end depending on means procuring. Now to this you say, that if I mean thus, that Glory does not depend on Obedience as a meritorious cause, it's impertinent, for a Condition is never intended for a meritorious cause, but as *causa sine qua non.*

Reply. First, That is a poor cause that effects nothing, and such is a *Causa sine qua non.*

Secondly, I deny that Obedience is antecedent to justification, and so not so much as *Causa sine qua non*; I have already proved that Justification is antecedent unto Faith, as it's strictly and properly considered; *God imputeth righteousness without Works*, Rom. 4. *He justifieth the ungodly*, Rom. 5.

Thirdly, Obedience preceeds not our Title to Glory, that we have by vertue of our Relation to Christ, and our Relation preceeds our Obedience: *The branch can't*

bear

bear fruit of himself, unless it be in the vine: Without me, saith Christ, *ye can do nothing*, John 15. 5. or *sever'd from me*, as the Margent has it.

Sixthly, You say, If Obedience does fit and prepare for happiness, then it does in some sence procure it, for we can't obtain happiness unless we be prepared and qualified for it.

Reply. You should have declared in what sence, and if you mean that it gives a Right to it which we had not before, I deny it; it's our Relation to Christ that gives us our Right and Title, and not any condition performed by us; nor may we ascribe to our selves our preparation to Glory; *It's God that worketh in us to will and to do of his own good pleasure: The vessels of mercy are afore prepared unto glory by God himself*, Rom. 9.

Secondly, It's Christ alone that is the procuring cause of Salvation or Glorification, *Rom.* 5. *As sin hath reigned unto death, so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.*

Seventhly, You say, till we believe in Christ, and yield our selves to be governed by him, we have no ground to believe that our sins are pardoned.

Reply. This I fully grant you; but it's one thing to have our sins pardoned, and another thing to know that they are pardoned; there is ground to believe that the sins of the Elect are pardoned, because the word declares it, *Rom.* 8. 33. but there is not ground for me to believe that I am one of God's Elect, and have a share in that pardon, till I do believe. You Query, What is this but a Condition?

Reply. It's wide from a Condition. Now I understand what you mean by it, you tell me *page* 34. that the performance of Duty gives a right to the Blessings.

Eightly, You said, you argued from several Scriptures, that Obedience and Holiness are so necessary to Happiness, that we shall not enjoy it without them,

and

and that all the Answer I make to it is this, that I grant it; yet is not this obedience the condition of our Interest in the Covenant of Grace, but the fruit thereof. You say, you do not understand this last clause.

Reply. I do not think it so obscure, but that you understand it well enough. If it be the condition of our interest, then it must be performed antecedent thereunto: If Faith and Obedience be the fruit of interest, then are they consequential thereunto.

Ninthly, You say, that your Conclusion which I told you was hastily drawn, is as far as you can yet see regularly drawn from the premises; that if pardon of Sin and Salvation were made over to us by the Gospel-Covenant, without any condition required of us to obtain them, it would destroy the Christian Religion, and open a gap to all Licentiousness. You say, my reply to this is, I know no Duty destroyed by it; there is enough for us to do, though it be not done as conditions; and though we are not to work for life, yet is there enough work to be done from life.

First, You say, that if I mean by this, that we must do good only upon the Score of Gratitude, this supposeth that we are already perfect, and that we have received all our Blessings already.

Reply. My Meaning is this, We must do good not only upon the score of gratitude, but in obedience to the will of God also, as being still under his sovereign power, and as a means to enjoy future blessings, which we have at present a right and title unto; *Being heirs of God, and Joint-heirs with Christ.*

Secondly, You say, if I mean that we must not serve God in hopes of the reward, this destroys many Christian Virtues, for the promises of Mercy are to encourage to Virtue.

Reply. If by a reward you mean a reward of Debt, we do not serve God in hopes of a reward, for we expect

pect nothing as a Debt; but if you mean a reward of Grace, that we have in our eye.

Thirdly, You Query, To what purpose the promises serve, if we must not make happiness a motive to Obedience? And what becomes of our Faith and trust in the promises, if we must not propound to our selves the blessings of the promises?

Reply. I know no body that denies this, but it is one thing to make the blessings of the Promises a motive to Obedience, and another thing to make them the end of our Obedience.

Fourthly, You Query, What need is there of fear and hope, if we must not avoid evil for fear of wrath, and do good in hopes of Mercy? And what would become of Patience and all Passive Graces, without the consideration of the reward?

Reply. First, The fear of the Lord, if it be Evangelical, ariseth from a sence of his Goodness as well as his Greatness: *There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared.* If fear hath no other object but the Wrath of God, that's a Slavish, not a Child-like Fear, it's a fear that perfect Love casteth out.

Secondly. That hope that expects happiness as its own earning, is a false hope; true hope expects all of Grace, and Patience waits on God for a reward of Grace likewise.

Thirdly, These Graces must all be exerted purely in obedience to the will of God; they will all live and thrive where nothing is done as a condition entitling us to future mercy.

Fifthly, You say, that this Doctrine condemns Christ himself and all the Saints, who served God day and night for that eternal happiness that they hoped to enjoy with him.

Reply. I shall not determine concerning Christ, who was the meritorious cause of all happiness; whether he

he did eye the reward as a motive, or as an end depending upon his obedience, as the procuring cause; but the Saints had their eye on their eternal happiness, as a motive encouraging unto duty, and not as an end depending thereon, or as a condition entitling thereunto.

Sixthly, You Query, Did not *Abraham* obey God, because he looked for a City that had foundations?

Reply. He had the promise of that City, antecedent to that obedience, and that gave him his Title thereunto, though the City he had a right to was a motive to his obedience.

Secondly, *Abraham* could obey where God commanded, though God made him no promise of a reward, as he did when he offered up his Son *Isaac*, Gen. 22.

You Query, Whether *Moses* had not respect to the recompense of reward? I answer, Yes, as a Motive: Whether *Paul* did not press after the mark of the prize of the high Calling of God in Jesus Christ?

Reply. He did, and that in point of duty; and not only so, but to the end that he might come nearer the mark, he had encouragement from the Promise so to do; but had he not a Title to what he prest after? was not *Paul* in Christ before this? were not things present and things to come too his? Did he do it as a condition that gave him a right to that which he had no title to before? Methinks you may discover these two things in this last instance of *Paul*.

First, That *Paul* did not perform duty, or press towards the mark, as a condition giving a right to what he aimed at, for that he had before; he tells the *Corinthians* himself, that things to come were theirs, and they were Christ's, and were not things to come his? was not he Christ's? he does not exclude himself, *Eph.* 1. 3. but puts in himself with the believing *Ephesians*, *as being blessed with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ*; his Title

Title was good, so that he did not press forward to that end, that he might get a right to future blessings.

Secondly, Though his Title was good and firm, yet *Paul* did not slack his pace, he still prest forward, he was one that was assured of Glory, 2 *Cor.* 5. 1, 2. And yet that did not abate the Exercise of his Grace, therefore this Doctrine does not destroy the Christian Religion, nor open a gap to Licentiousness: Do you not see that you have been beating the Air all this while?

Seventhly, You conclude, that it is not unlawful to to work for life, and to do good duties as Conditions to obtain happiness.

Reply. First, Your contending so much about the word *Condition*, not being satisfied with what I granted, that Salvation might be considered as an end following means preparing, but not as an end depending on means procuring, made me to suspect that you did place more in the word *Condition* than the Gospel did allow; so that our contest is not only about words, but about things, and that of the greatest concernment, and now it plainly appears; for Eternal Life must be eyed by us not only as a motive, but as the end of duty; it's that which we must work for. You say, *page* 34. that there are some duties required of us as conditions, to give us right to the blessings that God hath promised, and here that it's not unlawful to work for life, and to do good duties to obtain happiness, which is to the best of my understanding to seek Justification and Salvation by works, a thing condemned in the word: I can't think that he that works for life, does not expect life for working, nor do I now wonder that you should deny the freeness of the Covenant of Grace, seeing you are so much for Works.

Secondly, There is in this more than *Causa sine qua non*, that without which it can't be, this is that by which it is, not that without which some blessings cannot be enjoyed, but that which gives a Right and Title thereunto.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, If we must work for Life, and do good duties to obtain Happiness, then will the reward be reckoned not of Grace, but of Debt, *Rom.* 4. 4. *Now to him that worketh is the reward reckoned, not of Grace, but of Debt.*

Fourthly, If good Works do give us a right and title unto life, then is there room left for boasting, a thing that the Scripture never left room for, *Eph.* 2. 8. *Not of Works, lest any man should boast:* The Reader may by this see how dangerous a thing it is to deny the freeness and absoluteness of the Covenant of Grace, that it necessarily runs such upon seeking Justification by works, a task that *Adam* fell short of, tho' he was in a capacity to have performed it: A Task that no man in the World can perform. The Apostle tells the *Galathians*, that whoever of them were justified by the Law, they were fallen from Grace, and yet they did not insist on perfect obedience to the Law. I suppose, that by what I have here laid down, it appears, that the Covenant of Grace is a Free Covenant, the very Name declares it such, and that all the blessings thereof are bestowed *Gratis*, that our Title to all is by vertue of union with Christ, and not by any Condition performed by us; and if a Grant that there are some duties to be performed by the subjects thereof will not satisfie, but these duties must be lookt on as Conditions, the performance of which does entitle to these Blessings, such are never like to be satisfied by me.

SECT. VIII.

YOU say, a third Difference that I make between the Covenant of Grace, and that Covenant which the *Jews* entered into, was this: The Covenant of Grace contained Spiritual Blessings, but that Covenant contained Temporal Blessings only. To this you say, you proved

proved that the Covenant made with the *Jews* contained Spiritual Promiſes as well as Temporal, *Deut.* 30. 6. *God promiſed, that he would circumciſe the hearts of his people, and of their ſeed*; and to comfort them in their Captivity, God promiſed them, that he would not only bring them back into their own Land, *But he would take the ſtony heart out of their fleſh, that he would give them an heart of fleſh, and cauſe them to walk in his ſtatutes.*

My Reply to this you ſay was, that there is no ſpiritual Bleſſing or Promiſe put into the Book of the Covenant, *Exod.* 21, 22, 23. *Chapters*, nor yet *Deut.* 28. where the Bleſſings of this Covenant are put down, and that the Promiſe made in *Ezekiel* appertained to the Spiritual Seed only.

But, Sir, This was not all the Anſwer that I gave to it, I told you, if this Promiſe had been a Branch of that Covenant *Deut.* 29. into which all the natural ſeed were taken, then all ſhould have had the benefit of it. God is a Faithful God, a Covenant-keeping God.

Secondly, You ſay, though the places mentioned contain no ſuch Promiſe, yet it follows not, that there was no ſuch promiſe contained in the Covenant: There are ſeveral moral duties not expreſt in theſe Chapters, doth it therefore follow that they were not preſcribed to the *Jews?*

Reply. Firſt, Though Moral Duties are not here particularly expreſt, yet they are all comprehended, *Deut.* 28. 1. *If thou will indeed obey my voice, and do all that I command thee, then all theſe bleſſing ſhall come unto you*; among which there is not one ſpiritual bleſſing.

Secondly, It's rational to think, that the Book of the Covenant that was then confirmed with the blood of the ſacrifices, *Exod.* 24. 8. contained all the Promiſes that were then given forth, that were the promiſes of that Covenant; and it's as rational to think, that all the bleſ-

bleſſings of that Covenant were put down, *Deut.* 28. when according to the Tenor of that Chapter the Covenant was ſo ſolemnly to be renewed, *Chap.* 29. and yet there's not one ſpiritual Promiſe or Bleſſing.

Secondly, You ſay, that there is a ſpiritual bleſſing clearly expreſt, *Deut.* 30. 6. and this Promiſe belongs to that Covenant that was made with the natural *Jews* and their ſeed.

Reply. Here again I muſt enquire, what the reaſon is, that many of thoſe with whom this Covenant was made, went without the Benefit thereof? Your former Anſwer has been this, becauſe they did not perform the conditions that God required of them: But, Sir, this Promiſe is either to be underſtood of the firſt degree of Grace, or it is not; if it be, then is there no condition required in order to the enjoyment of it, granted by your ſelf *page* 31, 32. If it be not, then is this promiſe made but to a part of them, and ſo not a branch of that Covenant into which the whole were taken; then it reſpects thoſe only that obey the voice of the Lord with all their heart, in all things that he commands them, *verſe* 2.

Thirdly, You ſay, that this Covenant is delivered in one continued Speech, both in 29, and 30 *Chapters*, and here is no mention of two Covenants, the one containing temporal, the other ſpiritual Bleſſings; but one and the ſame Goſpel-Covenant containing both Spiritual and Temporal Bleſſings, as appears *Rom.* 10.

Reply. Firſt, The Covenant made *Chapter* 29. was to be made with *Iſrael*, according to the Words of the 28*th. Chapter*, as appears in the 1*ſt. verſe*; *Theſe are the words of the Covenant that the Lord commanded me to make with the Children of Iſrael.*

Secondly,

Secondly, This Covenant made in *Deut.* 29. is distinguished from that Covenant into which Heart circumcision was put, as appears by comparing *Deut.* 29. 25. with *Jer.* 31. 32. and whereas you compare the 15*th. verse* of the 30*th Chap.* with *Rom.* 10. there can be no more gathered from it than this, that they had the Gospel preached unto them, and that the promise of Life was made to them that believe as well as unto us.

You say, that this Covenant was obscured very much with Mosaical Ceremonies, and that these Ceremonies are usually called the *Covenant that God made with them in the day that he took them by the hand to lead them up out of Egypt*, and that it was this Covenant that was repeated *Heb.* 8. from 3, to 8.

Reply. First, I did in my last distinguish between the first Covenant mentioned in the *Hebrews*, and the Ceremonies that were annext to it: I shewed that not only the Ceremonies were abolished, but the Covenant it self also, as being not sufficient to answer all the ends of God, and to relieve the necessities of his people. To this you made no reply. Either these Ceremonies were a part of the Essence, or they were only annext, if they were only annext, it was to the first Covenant, not the second, *Heb.* 9. 1.

Secondly, You say your self, (*page* 9.) that the very words of the Covenant *Deut.* 29. are used by the Prophet, *Jer.* 7. 22, 23. to express the substance of the Covenant of Grace as distinct from the Ceremonial-Law: *I spake not to your Fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the Land of Egypt, concerning Burnt-offerings and Sacrifices: But this thing commanded I them, saying, obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people.* When was it that the Lord spake this to them? was it not when they came out of *Egypt?* and what was it that he spake to them? Why, *Obey my voice, and*

I will be your God; and what was this? Why, the very words of the Covenant, *Deut.* 29. so you call it; and that it expresseth the very substance of the Covenant that God made with them, as distinct from the Ceremonial Law; so then by your own words it appears, that the Covenant that God made with them *Deut.* 29. was the Covenant made when they came up out of *Egypt*, and that it was distinct from the Ceremonial-Law; and this is that Covenant also that is distinct from the Covenant of Grace, *Jer.* 31, 32.

You say, that Promise that the Lord made *Ezek.* 11. 19, 20. *That he would give them a new heart*; my Reply to it is, that it was made to a peculiar people among them, and not to the whole; to the spiritual seed, not to the natural, considered as such: This you think I have no ground for, and that for this reason, because it was made to all the *Jews* that yielded to the King of *Babel*, as the Prophet advised them *Jer.* 24. 5. *Ezek.* 11. 16, 17. and that it will be hard to prove that all to whom the promise was made were the spiritual seed.

Reply. That this promise was made to a peculiar people, is to be proved by the two Chapters last quoted, *Ezek.* 11. 21. As soon as God had made the promise of a new heart, *verse* 20. he comes with a smart threat immediately to some of the *Jews* that were in the same Captivity, *verse* 21. *But as for them whose hearts walk after their detestable things, and their abominations, I will recompence their way upon their own head, saith the Lord:* Who can believe that the promise of a New-heart was made to these? The other Chapter, *Jer.* 24. is more clear; there is a division made, some of them are compared to a Basket of good figs, the other to a Basket of evil figs; they were those of them that were compared to the good figs that had the Promise made to them; there was a fearful Curse donounc'd against the rest at the same time, *verses* 8, 9, 10. and they are not only

only threatned in general, but *Zedekiah* by name, and his Princes, and the residue of his People: This I gave you in my last, but you made no reply.

You say, it's certain that some of them were wicked to whom this promise was made, and frustrated God's design of mercy towards them, *Jer.* 29. 21, 23.

Reply. That those you mention were wicked is granted, but how does it appear that the promise was made to them? If you read over the Chapter, you may see plainly, that these were some of the evil figs that were to be devoured by the Curse.

Secondly, Though the Design of Man may be frustrated, yet the Design of God can't; his purpose can't be changed, his good will is unalterable; there is nothing that can fall out in time which he does not foresee, and which he is not able to prevent, how then can his Design to shew mercy be frustrated?

Thirdly, If those wicked ones had been of the number of those to whom the Promise was made, they should have enjoyed the benefit of it. You grant, that the first degree of Grace, by which the Understanding is enlightned, and the Will renewed, is absolute, and calling out of an Estate of Sin by the Word and Spirit is absolutely promised; now had these had their hearts and wills changed, they would not have have remained wicked; had the promise been made to them, they would have been turned from Sinners unto Saints, they would at least have been habitually holy; and had the Lord gone thus far with them, he would have gone farther, he would have put his Spirit within them, and have caused them to walk in his Statutes, and observe his Judgments, and do them; from which I conclude, either his promise was not made to all, or his Design of shewing mercy was frustrated by none. I think the Apostle clears the point, *Rom.* 9. 6. *It cannot be that the word of God has taken none effect, but all are not Israel that are of Israel*; He

does not hang it on conditions, but declares them to be a peculiar people to whom the promises were made.

Again, You say, you gave this reason why some among the *Jews* did not enjoy the benefit thereof, because they did not perform the Conditions; to which you say I replyed, that you did not shew me these Conditions, nor did I know what Conditions could be performed antecedent to a New Heart. You say, as there are special benefits promised, so there are conditions required answerable thereto; the Condition to qualifie for the first act of Pardon is Faith and Obedience, the Condition of Salvation is Holiness and Perseverance.

Reply. This Answer is beside the Question; the Question was not, what Condition is required to Justification or Glorification? but what is required antecedent to a New Heart, or Heart-Circumcision, the promise which you say was a part of that Covenant into which the natural seed entered, or what Condition can be performed antecedent to a New Heart?

You say, If by a New-Heart be meant the New-Creature, then are we required to labour together with Grace in the work of Sanctification, that we may be New-Creatures.

Reply. I can't think that you understand what you say, or else you think me so great a fool that any thing will pass with me: Can there be a work of Grace wrought in the Soul, a Work of Sanctification begun, and the New-Creature not formed in the Soul? wherein doth the New-Creature consist, but in the Change of the Heart? when the Soul is new formed, the New-Creature is set up in it; a New-Heart and the New-Creature is the same thing, not a Second Work of Grace depending upon any Condition to be performed by us.

Secondly, You say, if by a New-Heart be meant the first

first degree of Grace, whereby our Wills and Affections are reformed, and freed to good, then there is no antecedent condition required in order to obtain it, for we cannot will nor do good till God preventeth us with his Grace.

Reply. First, You have left it undetermined whether this Heart-Circumcision, *Deut.* 30. 6. be meant of the first degree of Grace or not.

Secondly, From what you have spoken, I conclude you do not now look on it as intending the first degree, but a farther carrying on the work of Sanctification in the Soul: The reason you give why many of the *Jews* went without the benefit of it, was, because they did not perform the Conditions thereof; and if so, then it can't be understood of the first degree of Grace, that by which the Understanding is enlightned, and the Will renewed, for that you say is absolute, and depends not on any condition to be performed by us.

Thirdly, If it be an increase of Grace that is here promised, then is the promise made to such only as did believe, and not to all, and so is not a branch of that Covenant in which the whole body of the natural seed stood.

Fourthly, You grant, that the first degree of Grace, by which the Heart and Will are changed, is absolutely promised in the Covenant of Grace, but many of the natural seed went without this; God did not give them Eyes to see, nor Hearts to consider; it was the *Election only*, among the *Jews*, *that obtained, and the rest were blinded*, *Rom.* 11. 7. therefore they were not the subjects of the Covenant of Grace; so that I have fairly gained this third mark of Distinction, that the Covenant of Grace contained Spiritual Blessings, that which the *Jews* entered into with their seed had only Temporal Blessings; you are not able to prove one Spiritual Blessing there.

SECT. IX.

YOU say, the fourth Difference that I made between the Covenant of Grace, and that which the *Jews* entred into with their seed, was in respect of the Subjects thereof; the Subjects of the one are the Natural seed, the subjects of the other are the Spiritual, such as are truly regenerate and holy. This description of *Abraham*'s seed, you say, I deny to be mine, and you grant it was not; it was your own, and that it's agreeable with the Scripture, for the regenerate only are true members of Christ, and that do imitate *Abraham* in Faith and Obedience, and they only that are Christs, and *Walk in the steps of Abraham's faith*, are properly *Abraham*'s Children, *Rom.* 4: 12. *Gal.* 3. 29.

Reply. If such only are *Abraham*'s Seed, and related to Christ, that are truly regenerate and holy, then such only are the Subjects of the New Covenant; *He saith not of seeds, as of many*, Gal. 3. 16. and you may observe that the Text you quoted, *Rom.* 4. 12. excludes a part of the natural seed; *He is the Father of circumcision, to them that are not only of the Circumcision, but also walk in the steps of the faith of Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.* Why have you endeavoured all along to prove that the natural seed, considered as such, had an interest in the Covenant of Grace, when they were not properly *Abraham*'s seed? they were properly his seed according to the flesh, but it should seem they were not so according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Grace; and why do you endeavour to bring in the Children of Believers, considered as such, that are neither his natural seed, nor yet his spiritual, that are not really regenerate and holy? for the Covenant of Grace takes in no more but *Abraham* and his Seed, *Gen.* 17. 7. *Gal.* 3. 16, 29.

Secondly,

Secondly, I deny that the regenerate are the only persons that are related to Christ; I have proved already that the Elect were given unto Christ before they were regenerated, *John* 17. 2. They were given unto Christ before Eternal Life was given to them by Christ; he prayed for none but those that were given to him by the Father, and yet he prayed for them that should believe as well as them that did believe; they were Christ's people before they were a willing people, *Psal.* 110. 3. And sure I am, *That those that are Christs, are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.* Union with Christ may come under a Threefold Acceptation, Fœderal, Actual, and Reciprocal. In the last Acceptation I grant that they are the regenerate only that are related unto Christ, but in the two former Acceptations all the Elect stand one with him.

Secondly, You say, that the Scriptures that you brought to prove that the promises of Pardon and Salvation are made to the wicked, on condition of Repentance and Newness of Life, I answer thus, that the Promises are offered to all where the Gospel is preached, but they are made to none but the spiritual seed.

Reply. First, That which is offered on Condition becomes not mine till the Condition be performed. You say your self, that Justification is promised on Condition of Faith and Obedience, but we have no right to it till we perform the Condition; so then the making a promise on Condition, does not prove their Interest in the Promise. You likewise confess the *Jews* had the offer of the promise before they believed, but had no actual right to it till they believed, *Acts* 2.

Secondly, When I denied that the Promise was made to more than the spiritual Seed, though it was a Negative, I proved it, *Gal.* 3. 16.

First, You say, if the Promises be offered to them, they must some way belong to them.

Reply. You should have proved what you first laid down, if you would have done any thing; that is, that the Promises are made to wicked Men, but this you can't; and I know not how the Promise belongs to them otherwise than in the tender thereof: And can you say of wicked Men, that they have an interest in the Promise, that never received it, meerly because they have the offer of it?

Secondly, You say, if the Blessings be offered to many, and not really intended to be given to them, what is that but plain deluding them, under the pretence of kindness? And such dealing is inconsistent with the Nature and Perfections of God.

Reply. First, That to delude Men under the pretence of kindness is inconsistent with the Nature of God, I grant, but that here is any such Delusion is denied.

Secondly, God offers nothing in the Promise, but if those to whom its offered will receive it, they shall have it; if they will not, the fault is their own, and the evil of rejecting it will one day be charged upon them; yet many that have the offer go without the Blessing.

Thirdly, You say, that what follows I made no Reply to, because there was no Scripture proof to it, which is an easie way of answering the most solid Reason.

Reply. I have reviewed what I then past over without a Reply, and I find nothing of Argument in it; there are some impertinent Similes of a Wife in Covenant with her Husband, and of a Servant with his Master, though both unfaithful, but what are these Similes to those that were never in Covenant? You do but beg the Question to say, that all that make a Profession of the true Faith are in the Covenant, though they do not walk answerable thereunto.

Fourthly, You say, that Text, *Rom.* 9. which I brought to prove, that all the Seed of *Abraham* had not an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, shews they were such of them

them as rejected Christ, and hardned their Hearts against him. My Reply to this, you say, is, that the Reason why they rejected Christ, was because they had no Interest in the Promise?

Reply. I think the Answer pertinent enough, and that there is ground for it in the Text, *verse 6.* it cannot be, *That the Word of God should have taken none effect, but all are not Israel that are of Israel:* That was the Reason why they went without the Benefit of the Promise, because they had no interest in it; they are the Children of the Promise that are accounted for the Seed, not the Children of the Flesh.

Secondly, You say, that when those *Jews* had rejected Christ, and continued obstinate in their Iniquity, they had then no in Interest in the Promise, nor were they the Children of God.

Reply. Interest in the Promise can't be lost; if they had no Interest when they rejected Christ, they had none before; nor Relation to God by vertue of Interest in the Promise can't be lost: *The Servant abideth not in the House for ever, but the Son abideth ever.*

Thirdly, You say, that whilst the Gospel was preached to them, and Grace offered, they had a possibility to have believed in Christ, and if they had believed, they would have been received as Children.

Reply. First, Here is a grant, that some of the natural Seed that were under Gospel means, were not the Children of God; and grant this, and it will necessarily follow, that they had no interest in the Promise, for they are the Children of the Promise that are accounted for the Seed.

Secondly, I deny, that barely the offer of Grace in the tender of the Promise puts Men into a capacity of believing; nothing short of the Principle or habit of Faith, which is infused in a Work of Regeneration, renders a Person capable of believing; there must be a Princi-

ple

ple of Life, or there can't be an Act of Life, men are ſpiritually Dead while in a natural State, *Eph.* 2. 1. the Underſtanding dark, wholly deſtitute of ſpiritual light, the Will non-compliant with the Will of God, and without a Principle of Grace, by which the Underſtanding is enlightened, and the Will reformed; it's impoſſible for Men to do what God requires, granted by your ſelf, (*Page* 31, 32.)

Fourthly, You ſay, they had Grace and Means allowed them, ſufficient to enable them to believe, otherwiſe they had not been bound to believe.

Reply. Firſt, I affirm, that all are bound to believe where the Goſpel comes, 1 *John* 3. 23. Were not Men bound to believe where the Goſpel comes, they could not be charged for unbelief.

Secondly, I deny, that all where the Goſpel comes have Grace allowed them, ſufficient to enable them to believe. We read of four ſorts of Ground on which the Seed was caſt, *Mark* 4. and there was but one of the four that had it's Nature changed, the other three remained the ſame, High-way, Stony, and Thorny Ground, as they were before; the good ground was antecedently good to the receiving of the Seed, it was immediately prepared by the Spirit, 1 *Cor.* 2. *The natural Man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, nor can he know them, for they are ſpiritually diſcerned:* He wants a ſpiritual Eye, which is always ſuppoſed neceſſary to behold a ſpiritual Object: *The carnal Mind is Enmity againſt God, and is not ſubject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be*, Rom. 8. 7. *To you its given to know the Myſtery of the Kingdom of God, but to them it is not given*, Mat. 13. yet theſe were the *Jews*, and ſuch as had the Goſpel preached to them; ſo that now it will be expected that you ſhould prove what you ſo boldly aſſert, that theſe *Jews* had Grace enough allowed them *to repent and believe*; and how that can be done, while the contrary lies ſo plain before you, I cannot tell.

Fifth-

Fifthly, You say, that it was their own fault that they did not believe.

Reply. I grant it: As a fault may be considered an evil, it was their Sin that they did not believe, but this proves not that they had a Power to believe.

Sixthly, You say, that Christ *would often have gathered them, but they would not.*

Reply. I grant it, in respect of the means that was afforded them, it was the revealed Will of Christ that they should believe, but was it his absolute Will? if it had, who could have hindered that?

Secondly, In that they would not believe, it appeared they could not; it's a sign their Wills were never changed, and if so, its granted by your self that they could not believe, (*Page* 32.)

Secondly, It was a sign they were none of Christ's People, for if they had, they should have been a willing People; *Thy People shall be willing in the day of thy Power.*

Seventhly, Christ spake and did many things (you say) *that they might be saved, but they would not come unto him that they might have Life*, John 5. 34, 40.

Reply. Did he change their Hearts, or did he not? If not, then they could not come to him; if he did, they would not have remain'd unwilling; the change of the Heart is always followed with the assistance of the Spirit, causing to walk in God's Statutes, and to observe his Judgments.

Eighthly, You say, that he told them that he was the *Messiah*, and that he did many Miracles among them by the Power of God, which did sufficiently testifie that he was sent by him, yet all this wrought no belief in them, all which did testifie that they were not those Sheep that heard the good Shepherds Voice, *John* 10. 25, 26.

Reply. All this I readily grant you, and I think I can't argue it more strongly than you have argued it

for

for me, and the Text last quoted makes against you; *Ye believe not, because ye are not my Sheep*; as I said unto you, *My Sheep hear my Voice, and they follow me:* He did not say, ye are not my Sheep, because ye believe not; *But ye believe not, because ye are not my Sheep*; unbelief is certainly the Consequence, if not the Effect of Non-Relation unto Jesus Christ; *Ye believe not, because ye are not my Sheep:* It was a certain sign, that they were none of Christ's Sheep, their abiding in unbelief; had they been some of Christ's Sheep, they should have heard Christ's Voice, *John* 10. 16.

Reply. This grant is as much as I desire, they were *Abrahams* Seed, and yet not the Children of the Promise, so that the Promise then is distinct from that Covenant into which the Natural Seed was taken; and what is the Promise here but the Covenant of Grace? And this is, as I said at first, the ground why they did not believe, because they had no Interest in the Promise, and that they had not an Interest in the Promise you have at last confest.

Again, you say, I do farther urge, that God is said to have loved *Jacob*, and to have hated *Esau*, and Question, how a Person can be hated of God, and yet a subject of his Love, and in the Covenant of his Grace? To this you say,

First, That when the Prophet speaks of Gods loving *Jacob*, and hating *Esau*, he intends it of their Posterity, *Mal.* 1. 2, 3, 4. and so *Obadiah.*

Reply. Whatever the Prophet intends, the Apostle speaks of the same two individual Persons, as appears by the Coherence; and the same two individual Persons are mentioned by the Prophet: *Was not Esau Jacob's Brother? Yet I loved Jacob, and hated Esau.* That of *Obadiah* is impernitent, it only mentions a Judgment threatned against the *Edomites.*

Secondly, You say, that a Man professing the true Faith

Faith, may be within the Covenant of Grace, though God does not accept his Person, nor approve his Work.

Reply. If God does not accept his Person, he hath no Interest in Christ, for all that have an Interest in him are accepted in that beloved, *Eph.* 1. 6. and if no Interest in Christ, then no Interest in the Covenant of Grace, *Gal.* 3. 16, 29.

Thirdly, You say, there is a twofold Love in God, a Love of Pity, and a Love of Complacency: God loved us all with a Love of Pity; *Even when we were dead in Trespasses and Sins*, Eph. 2. 4, 5. He Loves those only with a Love of Complacency who love him, *John* 14. 21.

Reply. That there is a twofold Love in God I grant; a Love to his own, and a Love to Strangers; the Lord loveth the Stranger, in that he giveth him Food and Raiment; that the Love of God is so to be distinguished as you have stated it, I deny; neither are the Scriptures you bring, to be taken in the sense you give of them; that in the *Ephesians* is not to be applied to all, but to a peculiar People, nor to be expounded barely of a Love of Pity, but of the good Will of God to his People. *First*, It's applied to a peculiar People, that are distinct from the World, as appears by the preceeding verses; *You hath he quickned, who were dead in Trespasses and Sins, who in time past walked according to the Course of this World, among whom we all had our Conversations in time past, and were by Nature the Children of Wrath even as others:* (As they stood related to the first *Adam* they were sentenced unto Wrath together with him,) *But God who is rich in Mercy, for the great Love wherewith he loved us, When we were dead in Trespasses and Sins, hath quickned us together with Christ: By Grace are ye saved:* This *us*, to whom this Love is applied, are distinct from others.

Secondly, It appears by the Effect, that they are a pecu-

peculiar People, and that it's not only a Love of Pity, but the good Will of God, or the Free Grace of God, *which was given to them in Christ Jesus before the World was.* Those that were thus loved of God were quickened together with Christ, *when they were dead in Trespasses and Sins.* This quickening here is to be taken in Point of Justification, for it's the same with saving in the next Verse; *By Grace ye are saved:* In this sense is the Word taken, *Col.* 2. 13, 14. *And hath quickened you together with him, having forgiven you all Sins, blotting out the hand-writing,* &c. A Soul is then said to be quickened when his Sin is pardoned, and the bond that bound over to Wrath cancelled. If Justification was not extended to all, then this Love was not extended unto all; for love, and quickening, or saving here in the Text, are of equal extent, with respect to the subjects thereof; *Whom he loved, them he saved.*

Secondly, That Text in *John* speaks not of the bestowing of Love, but of the Manifestation thereof: God's Love to us doth not depend on our Love to him, our Love to God is but a Fruit of his Love to us; *We love him, because he first loved us,* 1 John 4. 19. but the Manifestation of his love to us, though it be not an Effect, yet is it a consequent of our Love to him: *He that loveth me* (saith Christ) *shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him, and will manifest my self unto him:* The latter Clause is Explanatory of the former; *And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.* And the Love of Complacency that you speak of, is not a love that hath its beginning in time, but is comprehended in the good Will of God, which was to his People from Eternity, *Prov.* 8. 31. *And my delights were with the Sons of Men:* When? *why before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever the Earth or the World was made.*

Fourthly, You say, that as for that Text, *Gal.* 3. 16.

That

That the Promises that were made *to him and his Seed, not to Seeds*, in the Plural, which might make a difference between *Jew* and *Gentile*, but in the Singular, *which is Christ*, considered as Head of a Family, as appears in *verse* 14. and 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. so that all that are Members of that Body whereof Christ is the Head, have some Interest in the Promises; for all that profess Christ are externally in Christ, *John* 15. 6.

Reply. First, I grant, the Promises were made to Christ, as Head of a Body, and in him to all the Members of that Body, that Mystical Body whereof Christ is the Mystical Head, this is that I asserted at first; but the Question is, Who they are that are the Members of that Body? Not all that make a Profession of Christ, as you would gather from 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. there the Apostle speaks, as he does elsewhere, in the Judgment of Charity, but here in the Judgment of Infallibility: *To Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made:* This is certain, none can deny it. An infallible Mark or Character you have of the Members of this Body, *verse* 29. *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed*: He doth not say, If ye profess the true Faith, but if ye be Christ's; so that such as were given to Christ by the Father, and only such, are the Members of this Body, to whom the Promises were made.

Secondly, You grant, that this Body is made up both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*; now the *Gentiles* were not a professing People when the Promises were first made to them, *Rom.* 4. 17. *I have made thee a Father of many Nations*; speaking of those things that were not as if they were: These were all taken into Union with Christ, when he took our Nature upon him, *Eph.* 1. 10. the 2. 15, 16. *That he might make in himself of Twain one new Man, and that he might reconcile both unto God in one Body by the Cross*: *Jew* and *Gentile* were never one body politick, therefore it must be one body mystical; which could be no other

way

way but by union with him who is the Myſtical Head; and thus they were, when they were reconciled to God by the Croſs, or by the Blood of the Croſs; now thoſe only that are united to Chriſt are that Body to whom the Promiſes were made; they were made to no more than ſhall enjoy the good and benefit of them, *Rom.* 4. 16. *It is by faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end that the promiſe might be ſure to all the ſeed:* That in the 14th. *verſe*, that you brought to prove that Chriſt is the Head of a profeſſing family, is not to the purpoſe; that ſpeaks not of the *Gentiles* as a Profeſſing People, but of the *Gentiles* as redeemed by Chriſt; and the bleſſing of *Abraham* that is there ſaid to come upon them, is to be underſtood of all the poſitive good of the New-Covenant, Grace here, and Glory hereafter.

Secondly, You ſay, that all that profeſs Jeſus Chriſt are externally in him, and ſo have ſome right to the Promiſes.

Reply. Firſt, If by an External Intereſt in Chriſt you mean, that ſuch as make a profeſſion of Chriſt are in the Judgment of Charity to be lookt on as having an Intereſt in Chriſt, and conſequently in the Promiſes, I grant it; but if this be not your meaning, when you ſay they are externally in Chriſt, then I know not what you intend by it.

Secondly, If they are not really what they profeſs themſelves to be, however they may be lookt on by others, they have no Intereſt in Chriſt, nor in the Promiſes; they make themſelves Hypocrites by their Profeſſion, and ſuch have no intereſt in Chriſt by being Hypocrites.

Thirdly, Though thoſe that make a profeſſion of Faith are in the Judgment of Charity to be lookt on as having an Intereſt in the promiſe, yet this lets not their Children into the Judgment of Charity that make no Profeſſion.

Again,

Again, You say, you proved in your former that *Abraham*'s Spiritual Seed can't certainly be known by their Profession and Conversion.

Reply. First, Then we may not conclude, that every Professor is a Member of that Body to which the Promises are made. You grant in your Reply to *Gal.* 3.29. that it's the spiritual seed only that is there described, and I think it can't rationally be denied, but that the seed in the *29th. verse*, and the seed in the *16th.* are the same, and so the Promises are made to no more but the Spiritual Seed.

Secondly, I grant, the spiritual seed can't certainly be known to any but themselves: It's possible that a gracious soul may know himself to be one of that number.

Thirdly, There are none among the *Gentiles* that are the seed of *Abraham*, but such as are his spiritual or his mystical Seed, for that is it that I intend by his spiritual seed.

Fourthly, There are none but the seed of *Abraham* that are the subjects of this Covenant, whence I conclude that you can no farther look on a person to be a subject of this Covenant, than you can look on him to be one of the spiritual Seed; nor can you look on him to be one of the spiritual Seed farther than you can look on him to be a Believer, and so *walking in the steps of Abraham's Faith.*

Again, You say, that I acknowledge that such as truly repent have an Interest in the Covenant of Grace; and seeing I grant this, it must needs follow that they had a conditional right to the promise before their Conversion.

Reply. First, They had more than a Conditional Right to the Promise, they had an absolute right, and their Conversion is a fruit of their Interest: *To us are given great and precious promises, that by them we might be made partakers of the Divine Nature*, 2 Pet. 1.4. But what is this to those that never repent? Such as do in time repent are the Subjects of the New-Covenant, that's granted; they that never repent, were never the Subjects thereof.

You say, it seems you were mistaken, when you thought I had lookt on the regenerate to be the only Subjects of the Covenant of Grace, and that I do now declare that they are the Elect, and only the Elect, that I own to be the Subjects of that Covenant; and having described the Elect, I endeavoured to prove it. You say, it's strange to you that I make a difference between the Elect and the Regenerate, when you thought that according to my Principles I had held that the regenerate should never fall finally from Grace, and consequently that they were Elect.

Reply. I grant, that the regenerate are Elect, but all the Elect are not yet regenerate.

Secondly, I grant, the Regenerate to be the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace, but not the only Subjects thereof, so that my distinction deserves no Objection.

Secondly, I suppose by this time you are satisfied that it is my Principle that the regenerate shall not fall away.

Secondly, You say, I seem to contradict my self, when I say, shew me a Believer, and I will shew you an Elect Person, and yet conclude that the regenerate are not the only subjects of this Covenant; for if all true Believers are the Elect, then all the regenerate are the Elect, because all the regenerate are Believers.

Reply. I wonder how you came to think I contradict my self, or that this should be such a Paradox to you: That all true Believers are the Elect, is granted; that all the Elect do yet believe, is denied; the reason why I said, shew me a true Believer, and I will shew you an Elect Person, was, because Faith is so peculiarly the priviledge of God's Elect, that their Election may be argued from it; *They were those only that were ordained to eternal life that believed*, Acts 13.

Thirdly, You say, there are as great Errors in my description of the Elect, and my endeavours to prove them the only Subjects of the Covenant of Grace.

Reply.

Reply. If they be no greater than the seeming contradictions you charged me with, it's well enough.

The first Error you say is this, that I tell you Men are not elected upon a foresight of Holiness, but that they should be holy, *Eph.* 1. 4. You say, that there is a great difference between Election to the end, and Election to the means: Election to the means is not of Works, but of him that calleth, for God affordeth us the means of Grace, *that we should be holy*, Eph. 1. 4.

Reply. Here is not one word of the means of Grace, but of Grace it self; *That we should be holy, and without blame before him in love.* I told you there were four things which lay in the very surface of the Text: *First*, That this choice was of particular persons, *Paul* and the *Ephesians*. *Secondly*, That it was made before the foundation of the World. *Thirdly*, That it was made in Christ. And, *Fourthly*, It was, that we should be holy. Now shew me my Error in any one of these four if you can; and from hence I concluded, that we were not chosen upon a foresight that we would be holy, but that we should be holy; and if need were, I could back it with several Scriptures, but till I have a more pertinent answer to this, I shall stand by the same.

Secondly, You say, that Election to the End hath respect to Faith and Holiness as the Conditions, *For God hath from the beginning chosen us to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth*, 2 Thes. 2. 13. but if God elected Men absolutely, without any consideration of their Holiness, he might as well as bestow Salvation on them without Holiness, because the actual giving of Salvation is no more restrained than the willing of it.

Reply. Do you now deal fairly with me, in that you seem to intimate, that I have asserted Election to Salvation, without any consideration of Holiness as the means? You do not say that it's so laid down by me; but if you would not have it to be so taken by the Reader, why

have you phraſed it ſo dubiouſly ? I gave you a deſcription of the Elect, what was the reaſon you did not fairly recite it, but keep it dormant as it were ? was it not that you might have the greater Advantage upon me to expoſe my Principles to reproach ? but ſeeing you have dealt ſo unfairly with me, I ſhall briefly recite it my ſelf. The Deſcription that it gave you is as followeth, It's a choice that God hath made in Chriſt, before the foundation of the World, of a peculiar people to Salvation as the End, and to Sanctification as the Means. Here is no ſuch thing as Election to the end, without any conſideration of the means, I put both the means and the end in one decree ; *That we ſhould be holy*, and that we ſhould be happy, and both were proved 2 *Theſ.* 2. 13. *Eph.* 1. 4. but where you will find a Text to prove that Election to the end hath reſpect to Faith and Holineſs as conditions foreſeen, I know not, nor is there any ſuch thing as a conditional Election to be found in the Word. The Decree of God is abſolute, in which there is both the end and the means, the means are as abſolutely decreed as the end, and the Subjects ſhall in time enjoy both.

My Second Error you ſay is this, that I make God's electing Men to be antecedent to his foreknowledge; this you ſay is directly contrary to *Rom.* 8. 29. *Whom he did foreknow he alſo did predeſtinate :* Here Predeſtination is ſubſequent to Foreknowledge, and depends upon it, and if Election follows God's preſcience of Faith, or his foreacknowledging us for his, then Faith in order of nature is before Election, becauſe every object doth precede the act converſant about it.

Reply. How will you make good your charge againſt me here ? where I have aſſerted Election antecedent to the foreknowledge of God, I ſaid indeed that God did chooſe us, not upon a foreſight that we would be holy ; now I ſuppoſe there is a vaſt difference between that fore-

foreſight *Rom.* 8. 29. and a bare foreſight of what would be in time. *Leigh* in his Annotations, cited by *Wilſon*, tells you, that the word is not "That "he knew before, but he acknowledged before, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. *The Lord knoweth who are his: The Lord hath not caſt away his people whom he foreknew*, Rom. 11. 2. By preſcience here we are not to underſtand ſimply the foreknowledge of God, but his foreacknowledging, which is a knowledge with approbation. The Learned Dr. *Hammond* reads it, "Whom God hath fore-"approved and acknowledged to be his, according to the "purport of the Goſpel; whom he knew as a Shepherd "doth his flock: The *Annotations* reads it "Thoſe "whom he marked out as it were from all the Men in the "world, and ſet his affection upon: And you your ſelf read it here, "God's foreacknowledging us to be his, which "is the ſame thing with fore-chooſing, *Rom.* 11. *God hath* "*not caſt away his people whom he did foreknow:* For there is at this time a remnant according to the Election of Grace. Foreknowledge and Election are here put one for another: Now to ſay that I make Election antecedent to this Foreknowledge, is an abuſe offered me.

Secondly, You ſay, that Predeſtination is ſubſequent to Foreknowledge, and that it depends upon it.

Reply. This is yet to prove; though it be penn'd in the ſecond place, there is no firſt and ſecond in the decrees of God, but all things are at one act laid in the Counſel of the moſt High.

Thirdly, You ſay, that Faith was here foreſeen.

Reply. That's yet to prove too; I may not take it upon your bare Word: The Text ſpeaks of Perſons, not of Qualities or Qualifications, *Whom he foreknew*, or *Fore-acknowledged to be his*, (ſo you read it) and if it be the Perſon that is here ſaid to be foreknown, then it's not the Quality, and ſo Faith is not in order of na-

ture antecedent to Election, for that is not the object that the act is conversant about.

Fourthly, I deny, that predestination in this place is to the end: It's not to Salvation, but to be conformable to the Image of his Son. Predestination in this place is unto holiness: You your self expound it of suffering, *page* 21. he predetermined unto sufferings after the manner of Christ: Now there is a vast difference between suffering and reigning, the one preceeds the other; *If we suffer with him, we shall also reign with him.*

You say, my third Error is this, that I make some men to be the sheep of Christ whilst Unbelievers, and the Text I quote for it, is, *Joh.* 10. 17. *And other sheep I have, that are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one shepherd and one sheepfold.*

Reply. I think you can't charge me with an Error in speaking Christs words, and not charge Christ also: What have I here spoken but what Christ spake before? And wherein have I abused the sence of what Christ spake? *First*, Christ tells you he hath other sheep, he doth not say he shall have; he speaks not in the future, but in the present Tense; in the 14*th. verse* he speaks of some sheep that knew him; *I know my sheep, and am known of mine*; in this *verse* he speaks of other sheep that he had, these are distinct from them that knew him.

Secondly, He saith, that they are not of this fold; his sheep they were, but not yet folded; that is, not in that fold where those were that did already know Christ, these were sheep that did not know him, therefore they did not yet believe in him. *Thirdly*, He saith, *Them I must bring*; that is, into the same fold where those were that did know him; for he saith, *There shall be one shepherd and one sheepfold.* *Fourthly*, He saith, *They shall hear my voice*; they were his sheep at present, but they had not heard Christ's voice, therefore they had not yet believed.

Secondly,

Secondly, You say, that the Text speaks of the *Gentiles* only, and proves that they should in due time become his sheep; that is, *Hear his voice, and obey him.*

Reply. First, This Interpretation is too narrow, for not only the *Gentiles* are intended, but the *Jews* also, that is, the Elect among them; for by the fold here we are not to understand the *Jews*, as they are considered a National Church, but of such only as did know the Lord. In the first sence, the *Gentiles* were not to be brought into them: In the Second, the *Jews* were to be brought in as well as the *Gentiles*; that is, the Elect both of *Jew* and *Gentile*.

Secondly, I would Query, What Warrant you have to change the Tenses here, to put the future Tense for the present? Christ saith, *That other sheep I have*; you say, that other sheep he shall have.

Thirdly, You say, that Christ tells you, *His sheep hear his voice, and they follow him.*

Reply. It's granted, sooner or later they shall hear his voice, for they have a Promise in the Text, *They shall hear my voice:* But who are they that hear his voice? Are they not his sheep, his sheep antecedent thereunto? As for others, they do not hear his voice, they turn a deaf ear to the call of Christ, *John* 10. 26. *Ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep, as I said unto you:* They had no Relation unto Jesus Christ, and therefore did not believe in Jesus Christ; they were not Branches in the Vine, how then could they bring forth the Fruit of the Vine?

Fourthly, You say, that none are in Christ but such as are New-Creatures, 2 *Cor.* 5. 17.

Reply. Interest in Christ may come under a threefold Consideration.

First, It may be considered in respect of Donation, as being given him by the Father, *John* 17. *Thine they were, and thou gavest them unto me:* This Gift of the Father to

the Son, was antecedent to the Gift of Eternal Life to them by the Son, *verse* 2.

Secondly, Interest in Christ may be considered in respect of actual Union: Christ in taking our nature upon him took us into union with himself, *Eph.* 1. 10. the 2. 14, 16. *He took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham*, Heb. 2. or, *He taketh hold of the seed of Abraham*, Margent.

Thirdly, Interest in Christ may be considered in respect of Reciprocation; and in this last sense I grant, that none are in Christ but such as are New-Creatures; but in the two former, the Elect are in Christ antecedent to the New-Creature. I think this is held as a Maxim, that Union is the ground of Communion; the New-Creature is communicated, *Tit.* 3. 6. *The branch cannot bear fruit of it self, unless it be in the vine:* Christ is the Vine, the Believer is the Branch, Faith is the Fruit; the Branch must be in the Vine antecedent to the bringing forth the fruit of the Vine.

My Fourth Error, you say, is this, that I appropriate all the Blessings of the Covenant of Grace to the Elect: Here you grant that none but the Elect or faithful persevering Christians shall inherit Eternal Glory, but there are many Blessings of the Covenant, as Vocation, and many offers of Grace and Mercy that are come upon all Believers.

Reply. First, I would Query, Whether by the Elect or faithful persevering Christians you intend the same Persons as I think you do? if not, then I would Query how it appears that there are faithful persevering Christians amongst the Non-Elect?

Secondly, If by Believers here you mean true Believers, then you do not convince me of Error; for if they do believe, they are Elect, and so you bring in no more to share in New-Covenant-Blessings than I do: If they be not true Believers, then whatever they do profess, they

are

are but Hypocrites and Unbelievers, and the greater their profession is, the greater is their Hypocrisie: Now that there is any New-Covenant Blessing which belongs to those that live and dye Unbelievers, I deny.

Thirdly, There are some things that belong to the Elect by vertue of the New-Covenant, which are New-covenant Blessings unto them, that yet are not so to others, though they have them. Food and Raiment comes to the Elect by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, and the same things come to *Pagans* and *Heathens*, that have no Interest in the Covenant of Grace.

Fourthly, To be under a Gospel-call, and not to Answer it, will be an Aggravation of a Persons Misery.

Secondly, You say, that Vocation and several offers of Grace and Mercy belongs to all Believers: If by Vocation you intend an Effectual Call, this belongs to the Elect only, *Rom.* 8. 30. *Whom he did predestinate, them he also called:* But if by Vocation you intend a common Call, this is extended to all where the Gospel comes; this has been and may be to *Jews* and *Pagans* that reject it, and such you grant have no Interest in the Covenant of Grace.

Thirdly, You say, the whole Church of *Ephesus* were blest with all spiritual Blessings necessary to bring them to Heaven, *Eph.* 1. 3. But it can hardly be proved that they were all elected, and continued faithful unto the end; nay, some of them did fall, and were threatned unless they repented, *Rev.* 2.

Reply. First, If they were blessed with all spiritual blessings necessary to bring them to Heaven, then they were blest with perseverance; unless you will deny that to be a spiritual Blessing, or that Perseverance is necessary to bring to Heaven, but neither of these can be denied. For *First* Perseverance is a promised Blessing, and of a spiritual Nature, *John* 10. 28.

Secondly, It's so necessary to Salvation, that without it

it a Person can't be saved; *He that endureth to the end, the same shall be saved.*

Secondly, You say, that it can hardly be proved that they were all elected, and continued faithful unto the End.

Reply. First, The one may be proved as well as the other; he that saith, *They were blessed with all spiritual blessings*, doth likewise declare, *That it was according as he had chosen them in him before the foundation of the World, that they should be holy, and without blame before him in love.* Here is both their Election and their Perseverance asserted; their Election in that they were chosen unto holiness, their Perseverance in the last Words, *Without blame before him in love.* Apostacy never leaves a Soul blameless: If they were chosen to a blameless state, then to a persevering state, but they were chosen to a blameless state, therefore to a persevering state.

Secondly, I suppose you are not ignorant, that when the Apostle writes to particular Churches, and declares what Blessings are bestowed upon them, he writes in the Judgment of Charity, looking on them to be such as they profess themselves to be, though the Rules he gives them to observe are infallible, *Phil.* 1. 7. *He that hath begun a goood work in you, will not cease to perfect it, as it's meet for me to think so of you all:* Did the Apostle *Peter* style the Church *Elect according to the foreknowledge of God*, 1 Pet. 1. 2. otherwise than in the Judgment of Charity? If they were not in reallity what they profest themselves to be, then they were not blest with all those spiritual Blessings; and if some of these fall away, nay, grant that they did totally and finally fall away, all that can be said of them is this, *They went out from us, but they were not all of us; if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us.*

Fourthly, You say, that all that can be gathered from *Rom.* 11. 6. is the remnant of the *Jews* that believed and obey-

obeyed the Gospel, obtained Justification, the rest that resisted the Gospel grew obstinately blind.

Reply. First, I would Query, Whether they did not obtain Sanctification as well as Justification? Whether Faith was the Improvement of Nature? was not that a New-Covenant Blessing?

Secondly, I grant that some of them believed, and obeyed the Gospel, and the rest did not; but who were they that believed and obeyed? were they not the Elect only? And who were they that rejected Christ? were not they the Non-elect? *The Election hath obtained, and the rest were blinded.* Do what you can, you can't bring in one person more than the Elect to share in New-Covenant Blessings.

Fifthly, You say, that though those that reject the Gospel are cast off and excluded the mercies of it, yet those that embrace the Gospel are in the Covenant of Grace, and in a good Capacity to obtain the Blessings thereof.

Reply. I grant it: Such as do truly embrace the Gospel, if they believe in Jesus Christ, they have obtained some of them already, and they shall obtain the rest; *He that believeth, shall be saved:* Yet are these the Elect still, for Faith is so peculiarly the Priviledge of the Elect, that from the one the other may be argued, 1 *Thes.* 1. 4.

My Fifth Error, you say, was this, that Christ suffered only for the Elect, which I endeavoured to prove by these Scriptures, *Isa.* 53. 8. *John* 10. 15. *Eph.* 5. 25. *John* 17. 9. where it is said, *That Christ was smitten for his people, and laid down his life for his sheep, and gave himself for his Church, and prayed for those that were given him of the Father, and not for the World.* You say, its true that Christ gave himself for his Church and People, and he died for all men too; *For Christ is the Saviour of all men*, (saith the Apostle) *especially of those that believe,*

believe; 1 Tim. 4.10. He is a ſpecial Saviour of the Faithful, in that he hath not only ſatisfied for their ſins, but will confer on them the benefits of Redemption; and he is a General Saviour to all Men, in that he hath paid the price of their Redemption, and reſtored them to ſuch a Capacity of Salvation, as that they may obtain it, if they be diligent; and they that periſh do not periſh for want of Redemption purchaſed for them, but through their own wicked wilfulneſs.

Reply. I muſt in the firſt place take a litte notice how you read this Text, that you have ſo largely paraphraſed upon; you ſay the Apoſtle tells us, *That Chriſt is the Saviour of all men, but eſpecially of them that believe:* I muſt object againſt your reading the Text, as well as againſt your Expoſition, there is not a Word of Chriſt in the Text, nor is Chriſt conſidered there as Mediator; the Text runs thus, *For this cauſe we both labour and ſuffer reproach, becauſe we truſt in the Living God, who is the Saviour of all men, but eſpecially of them that believe:* Now though Chriſt as Mediator is God as well as Man, yet he is not here conſidered as Mediator, nor as diſtinct from the Father and the Spirit: As he is in his Mediatory Office, the living God in this place is to be conſidered Father, Son and Spirit.

Secondly, This Text ſpeaks not of Redemption, but of an outward Salvation, which by the providence of God is extended unto all, but eſpecially to them that believe; that it intends an outward Salvation appears, *Firſt*, in that it's oppoſed to ſuffering, and is a Ground of Encouragement to the people of God in ſuffering; *We therefore labour and ſuffer, becauſe we truſt in the living God*; but what do they truſt in God for? I anſwer, it's for Salvation; and what is that Salvation? Why, ſuch as is extended to all Men, it's a Common Salvation in reſpect of the matter of it, though it be extended to Believers in a ſpecial manner; it comes to them through the

the Covenant of Grace, they are under his ſpecial Providence, and nothing ſhall befall them but what ſhall be for their advantage: God hath promiſed them, *That he will not ſuffer them to be tempted above what they are able to bear*, 1 Cor. 10. 13.

Secondly, It appears that it is an outward Salvation, in that Believers, conſidered as ſuch, are the ſubjects thereof; *He is the Saviour of all men, but eſpecially of them that believe:* But Believers, conſidered as ſuch, are not the Subjects of Redemption: *Chriſt died for ſinners, the juſt for the unjuſt, that he might bring them unto God.*

Secondly, You ſay, that Chriſt will confer on them that believe the Benefits of Redemption.

Reply. Firſt, I would Query, Whether Chriſt will confer on them that believe all the benefits of Redemption, which will amount to a full, ample and compleat Diſcharge from all ſin, paſt, preſent and to come? this I ſuppoſe you will not grant me, for it would interfere with your principle of falling from Grace; if all ſin, paſt, preſent, and to come, were pardoned to every believer, then there could be no ſuch thing as a Believer to fall away and be damned.

Secondly, I would Query, How Chriſt may be ſaid to be a Special Saviour to them that believe, when ſome of them that believe may at laſt fall away and be damned as well as others? for ſo you hold; but how inconſiſtent ſuch principles are, let the Reader judge.

Thirdly, I would Query, Whether Faith it ſelf be not one of the Benefits of Redemption? Whether it be not one Branch of the Bleſſing of *Abraham* that comes on thoſe that are redeemed from the Curſe of the Law, *Gal.* 3. 13. and how it comes about that Faith comes on ſome that are redeemed by Chriſt, and not on all.

Secondly, You ſay, that he is a General Saviour to all Men, in that he hath paid the price of their Redemption.

Reply.

Reply. If Christ hath paid the price of their Redemption, then Justice is satisfied with the price paid, or it is not: If it be, then Justice it self pleads their discharge for whom the price was paid; if it be not, it's for want of Merit in the price paid, and that were blasphemy to assert.

Secondly, If Christ paid a price for all, then all are discharged, or they are not; if they are, then none shall perish; if they are not, then are they denied that which in Justice is their right.

Thirdly, If Christ hath paid a price for all, then he hath his purchase, or he hath not: If he hath, then are all justified, *Isa.* 53. 11. *By his Knowledge shall my righteous Servant justifie many, for he shall bear their Iniquities.* Those whose Sins were born by Christ were justified by Christ, 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. *By whose stripes ye were healed.* If he hath not his purchase, then the Promise fails to Christ, *Isa.* 53. 10. *When thou shalt make his Soul an offering for Sin, he shall see his Seed, he shall see of the travel of his Soul, and shall be satisfied:* Who can think that Christ sees of the travel of his Soul with satisfaction, when so many thousands for whom he travelled in Soul, and for whose Sins he made his Soul an offering, to go without the Benefit of it?

Thirdly, You say, that all Men are restored to such a Capacity of Salvation, that they may attain it if they are diligent to do their Duty.

Reply. Is there a Power given to all to do what God requires, or is there not? If you say there is, then I would desire you to answer those Scriptures that seem to me to speak the contrary, *Rom.* 8. 7, 8. *Heb.* 11. 6. 1 *Cor.* 2. 24. If you say, that all Men have not a Power to do what God requires of them, then they are not restored to such a capacity as to be saved, let them do what they can.

Secondly, Are all called by the Word and Spirit? have

have they the first Degree of Grace, by which their Understandings are enlightened, and their Wills renewed, or have they not? If you say they are, then I would desire you to prove it too, and shew me how those may be said to be called by the Word and Spirit, that never had the Word vouchsaf'd to them; if you say, they are not so called and qualified, then they can't possibly do what God requires of them, granted by your self, *pag.* 31, 32.

Fourthly, You say, that none do perish for want of Redemption purchased for them, but through their own wicked Wilfulness.

Reply. First, If there be Redemption purchased for all, then all have the Benefit of it, or they have not: If they have, then have all their sins pardoned, for Redemption and Remission of Sin is the same thing, *Eph.* 1. 7. *In whom we have redemption through his Blood, even the forgiveness of our sins:* If they have not, then are they denied that which in justice they ought to have. It's inconsistent with the justice of Man to hold a Captive still in bonds when his Freind hath paid his Ransom. But you will say, that some will not consent to be discharged upon the account of the Ransom paid by Christ. I answer, the Question is not what men will consent to, but what the Father by vertue of the Compact between the Son and himself hath consented unto: Either the Father did consent that those for whom the Son paid this Ransom, should be discharged, or he did not; if he did, then are all discharged, if not, then none could be discharged, for it was not the price paid, (though it was of infinite worth) that could procure the Discharge of any, but the consent of the Father, to receive the satisfaction in the payment of it. A Creditor may refuse a Debt, when tendered by another, he may require it of the Debtor, but when he hath consented to take it of a Surety, then he can't refuse it, nor can he hold the

Debtor

Debtor under Obligation, having received full satisfaction by the Surety.

Secondly, Christ hath purchased Redemption from all sins, or he hath not; if he hath, then for their Unbelief, then for their wicked Wilfulness, so that there is now nothing left to damn where Christ died to save; if he hath not, then do they still perish for want of Redemption purchased for them.

Thirdly, The Efficacy of the price paid by Christ did depend on the Will of the Creature, or it did not: If it did, none could have the Benefit of it. Naturally men are averse to Jesus Christ, and to Salvation by Christ: Men will not come to Christ that they may have life. A Will to come to Jesus Christ is one of the Positive Blessings of the New-Covenant, held forth in a free Promise, *Psal.* 110. 3. But men must be at liberty from the Curse of the Law, antecedent to the enjoyment of this Blessing, *Gal.* 3. 13, 14. If the Efficacy of the price did not depend on the Will of the Creature, then all for whom the price was paid shall have the Benefit thereof.

Fourthly, Either Jesus Christ redeemed all from final Unbelief, or he did not; if he did, none shall perish for Unbelief; if he did not, then some shall perish for want of a Redeemer.

Secondly, You say, that in this sense the Scripture plainly teacheth that Christ died for all, *John* 3. 16, 17. 1 *John* 2. 2. You say, *God so loved the World, that*, &c. and that Christ came to save the World, and that he is a Propitiation for the sins of the whole World.

Reply. I suppose that one Answer may serve to all these Scriptuees, for it's the word *World*, or the *whole World*, that you insist upon.

First, This word *World* hath various Acceptations in Scripture, and nothing may be concluded barely from an equical word farther than the Scope of the place leads to it. There are three Acceptations of the word

word in one *verse*, John 1. 10. *He was in the World*; that is, the Habitable Part of the World; *and the World was made by him*; the whole Universe, Heaven and Earth, and all things therein; *and the World knew him not*; the poor, blind, unregenerate part of the World. In this last Acceptation the Word is taken, 1 *John* 5. 19. *Beloved, we are of God, and the whole World lieth in Wickedness:* There were some that were born of God, therefore it can't be understood of every individual person, but of the unregenerate only.

Secondly, The word is sometimes to be taken of all Believers in the World, *Col.* 1. 6. *The Gospel that is come unto you, as it is unto all the World, and bringeth forth fruit in them, as it doth also in you.*

Thirdly, It's sometimes to be understood of the Non-elect, *John* 17. *I pray for these, I pray not for the World.*

Fourthly, It's taken for the Elect only, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing unto them their Trespasses:* The Non-imputation of Sin is their Discharge from sin, and such are in a blessed state, *Rom.* 4. *Blessed is the man whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sin is covered; blessed is the man to whom the Lord does not impute sin.* In this last sence I take the word in the three Scriptures that are before us, that in *John* 3. 16, 17. tells us, *That God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son*, &c. This is the greatest and most special Love of God, such a love that can withold nothing from those to whom or for whom Christ is given: *He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not with him freely give us all things?* Rom. 8. 31. He that hath given his Son will give his Spirit too, he will give Grace and Glory to those to whom he hath given his Son, *verse* 17. *God sent not his Son to condemn the World, but that the World through him might be saved:* This is the same World for whom his Son was given. In the *verse* before. If it were the end of

God in sending Jesus Christ to save the World, then that World for which Christ was sent shall be saved; there is no frustrating the end of God. You grant *page* 51. that none shall be saved but the Elect, or Faithful Persevering Christians, (which is the same thing) and if none but the Elect shall be saved, then that world that Christ came to save are the Elect only. As for the third Scripture, 1 *Joh.* 2.2. *He is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world*; the Word signifies a peace-making Sacrifice: Now those for whom he hath made this peace, shall in time enjoy it, they shall enter into peace, and these are the Elect only, for they only shall be saved, *Rom.* 5. 10. *If when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more being reconciled we shall be saved by his life.* Reconciliation was the hardest part of Christ's Undertaking; it's easie for Christ to sanctifie and glorifie, in respect of what it was to reconcile; and having performed the most difficult Task of all his Undertakings, he will not fail to perform the lesser part; those that are reconciled by his death, shall certainly be saved by his life.

Thirdly, You say, that Christ came to seek and to save that which was lost, *Luke* 19. 10.

Reply. First, What Christ came to do, that he did, or he did not; if he did, then are those saved, and if saved, it is from sin; if he did not, either it was for want of Will, or for want of Power, neither of which can be charged on Christ.

Fourthly, You say, that Christ was made under the Law to redeem those that were under the Law, *Gal.* 4. 4. but all were lost by transgression, and were under the Law, therefore Christ came to redeem and save all.

Reply. First, If we consult the Coherence, we shall find that this Scripture treats of a peculiar people. In the preceeding verses you have a simily of an *Heir, while in his Nonage he differs not from an hired Servant,*

though

though he be Lord of all, but is under Tutors and Governours, till the time appointed of the Father: This he applies to a Peculiar People, *verse* 3. *So we, when we were Children, were in bondage under the Elements of the World, but when the fulness of time was come,* &c. Now to what end did God send forth his Son to redeem? Was it not that we might receive the Adoption of Sons? He applies it still to a peculiar people. Adoption is an act of Grace without us, that works no inherent Change in us; it gives us relation to God, but makes us not like unto God. Adoption may come under a threefold Consideration: *First*, In respect of Predestination, *Eph.* 1. 5. *Who hath predestinated us to the adoption of Children,* &c. *Secondly*, In respect of the Covenant, as it was transacted between the Father and the Son, and in this respect they were his Children before he took their nature on him, *Heb.* 2. *I, and the Children that the Lord hath given me; and because the Children were partakers of flesh, he also himself took part of the same. Thirdly*, In the respect of the Consummation of the Covenant, by the offering up of the Lord Jesus; and in this sense I take it here, *That we might receive the adoption of Sons*; not in respect of any act of ours, but in respect of the Confirmation of the Covenant of Grace by the Oblation of Christ; and so the Word *Received* is taken elsewhere, *Heb.* 9. 15. *For this cause he is the Mediator of the New-Covenant, that by means of death for the transgressions that were under the first Covenant, they that are called might receive the promise of Eternal Inheritance:* They that were called, though they had received the promise by Faith, yet they had not received the promise in respect of the Confirmation thereof, till Christ was offered up. A Testament is not of force till men are dead; when the Testator is dead, then the Testament is of force, *Heb.* 11. *ult. These all died in faith, not having received the promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.* They

applied the Promiſe before us; they died in Faith, but they did not receive the Promiſe in reſpect of the Confirmation of it before us; upon that account their Perfection and ours was together and at once, and in this ſenſe I take the Word *received*, *Gal.* 4. 6. and that for this Reaſon; there could be no Act of Application on our part, antecedent to the ſending forth of the Spirit of his Son into our Hearts; but this Reception of the Adoption of Sons is antecedent to the ſending forth of the Spirit of his Son; *Becauſe ye are Sons, God hath ſent forth the Spirit of his Son into your Hearts, crying, Abba, Father*: So that this Text ſpeaks of the Children only, not of others, of ſuch as are ſo redeemed as never to come under Bondage more: *Wherefore thou art no more a Servant, but a Son.*

Secondly, To be *redeemed from the Curſe of the Law*, and yet to remain *under the Curſe*, are Terms inconſiſtent; but ſome are under the Curſe of the Law, ſince Chriſt was offered up; *As many as are of the Works of the Law are under the Curſe*; but who are they? I Anſwer, they are ſuch as have no Relation unto Jeſus Chriſt, ſuch as are not *Abraham*'s Seed. This Text divides the whole World; *So then they that are of Faith*; that is, they that are of Chriſt, Faith being here conſidered objectively; *are bleſſed with faithful Abraham*, but others are under the Curſe.

You ſay, that all were loſt by Tranſgreſſion, all were under the Law, therefore Chriſt came to redeem and ſave all.

Reply. What Chriſt came to do, that he did; *I have finiſhed the Work that thou gaveſt me to do*, John 17. 4. but all are not redeemed by Jeſus Chriſt, ſome are under the Curſe of the Law ſtill; all will not be ſaved by Jeſus Chriſt, ſome will periſh in their Sins, therefore Jeſus Chriſt did not come to redeem and ſave all.

Fifthly, You tell me, that it's expreſly ſaid, that Chriſt

Christ *gave himself a ransom for all*, 1 Tim. 2. 6.

Reply. First, This word *All* is an equivocal Word, and may be taken more largely, or more strictly, therefore nothing may be concluded from it, farther then the scope of the place leads to it, or than the Harmony of the Scripture may be preserved, *John* 12. *And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all Men unto me*; take the *All* here of every individual Person in the World, and it will not hold good; for all Men are not drawn to Jesus Christ, all Men have not Faith, and without Faith they can't come to Christ; all Men have not the means by which Men are drawn to Jesus Christ; but take it of those that are given unto Jesus Christ, and it will hold good; *All that the Father giveth me shall come unto me.* John 6. 37.

Secondly, The Word *All* in the Text before us can't possibly be extended beyond those that have the Word vouchsafed unto them; for this ransom was to be testified in due time, it was to be published and proclaimed; but to whom? I Answer, to those for whom he gave himself; and when? it must be in due time; and when is that, but while Men are in the Land of the living, while they are in a Capacity of coming unto Jesus Christ, and believing on him? but there are many that have not the Word vouchsafed to them, to whom it was never testified, therefore this ransom was not given for all.

Sixthly, You say, that Jesus Christ died for all, 2 *Cor.* 5. 15.

Reply. The Word *All* in this place can't be understood of more than do in time answer the end of his Death; that is, that they should live to him that died for them. The end of Christ can't be frustrated, he did not only die to justifie, but to sanctifie also, *Eph.* 5. 25, 26. he did not only die to redeem from guilt, *But to purifie to himself a peculiar People zealous of good Works*,

Tit. 2. 14. but all do not live to Jesus Christ, therefore he did not die for all.

Seventhly, You say, that he *tasted Death for every Man*, Heb. 2. 9.

Reply. This Word *every Man*, as well as the Word *all*, may be restricted to a peculiar People, 1 *Cor.* 4. 4. *Judge nothing before its time, till he cometh that shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the secrets of all Hearts, and then shall every Man have Praise of the same:* This can't be understood of *every Man* that shall be judged, but of every one that hath in a measure conformed to the Will of God; of them that stand at his right hand, not of them that stand on his left: He will say to them, *I was hungry, and you fed me not*, &c. These shall never have Praise of the same.

Secondly, The subjects of the Apostles Discourse, *Heb.* 2. are the Children of God, the Seed of *Abraham*, as appears in the following Verses, and to these must the Word *every Man* be restricted; it is not Reason to think, that the Word was intended of more than were the subjects of the present Discourse.

Eighthly, You say, how these and such like Scriptures may be reconciled with a particular Redemption, you do not know.

Reply. I have in my Answer shewed you as well as I can, how these Scriptures may be taken, so as that not one of them may interfere with particular Redemption; and have opened them so, as that the Harmony of Scripture may be preserved; but to take these general Terms in the sense that you do, neither you nor any Man else can preserve the Harmony of Scripture. Should the Word *World* be always taken for every individual Person in the World, then must we conclude, that none knew Jesus when he was in the World, 1 *John* 10. *The World knew him not:* This would interfere with *John* 10. 14. *I know my Sheep, and am known of mine*, 1 John 3. 19.

5. 19. *We know that we are of God, and the whole World lieth in Wickedneſs:* It can't be ſuppoſed, that thoſe that were born of God did lie in wickedneſs, and yet the whole World did lie in wickedneſs; *John* 17. *I pray for theſe, I pray not for the World.* Did Chriſt pray for ſome, or did he not? If he did, then by the Word *World* can't be meant every individual Perſon; if he did not, then tell me what he means, when he ſaith? *I pray for theſe.* Take the Word *every Man*, 1 Cor. of all that muſt be judged, and then thoſe that ſtand at his left hand, of whom Chriſt will ſay, *I was hungry, and you fed me not*, muſt have Praiſe of the ſame, as well as thoſe that ſtand on the right hand. And as great abſurdities would follow if the Word *All* ſhould always be taken in the utmoſt extent, for then thoſe that never heard of the Goſpel ſhould be drawn to Jeſus Chriſt, as well as thoſe that have, *John* 12. *I will draw all Men to me.*

Ninthly, You ſay, if Chriſt died for the faithful only, then he can't in any ſenſe be ſaid to die for others, but if he died for all, then he may truly be ſaid to die for his People in a ſpecial manner.

Reply. Firſt, I never ſaid that Chriſt died for the faithful only, nor do I believe that he died for the faithful at all, conſidered as ſuch; he died for Sinners, *The Juſt for the Unjuſt, that he might bring them unto God*; he died for the unfaithful, that he might make them faithful.

Secondly, I deny, that Chriſt died in a ſpecial manner for ſome, and in a common manner for others; the Scripture makes no ſuch diſtinction, and I hope I have removed what you have offered in the Caſe already.

Tenthly, You ſay, that though it be granted, that Chriſt interceeded only for the faithful, and not for the World, yet that proves not that he did not die for the World.

Reply. I desire no such grant: I did not say, that Christ prayed only for the faithful; I told you, he prayed for them that should believe as well as them that did believe; he prayed for all that were given him of the Father. However, here is a grant, he prayed not for the World, and that is ground enough for my Conclusion: If he prayed not for the World, he died not for the World; I think I may safely argue (here) from the lesser to the greater; if he would not breath out a Request for them, he would not breath out his Life for them; if he would not offer up a Prayer for them, he would not offer up his Soul for them.

Eleventhly, You say, the special Benefits of Redemption belong to the faithful, and Christ intercedes with the Father for to give them out to them.

Reply. Here I would Query, *First*, What you mean by the special Benefits of Redemption? Whether Remission of Sins be one of them? If it be, then none are redeemed but such as have this Blessing bestowed on them; you can't sever Redemption and Remission of Sin, *Eph.* 1. 7.

Secondly, Whether Faith be not one special Benefit of Redemption? Whether it be not one Branch of the Blessing of *Abraham*, that comes on those that are redeemed from the Curse?

Thirdly, Whether it be given to all to believe? if it be, then all shall enjoy the special Benefits of Redemption, Pardon of Sin, and Eternal Salvation. If you say, its given to all to believe, I would then enquire, How such as never heard the Word came by it? Faith (in respect of the Act) cometh by hearing, if Faith be not given to all, how it appears that all are in a capable way of Salvation, according to your own Principles? For you say, that the prime Blessings of the Covenant, as Justification and Glorification, are bestowed on none, but on Condition of Faith and Repentance.

Twelfthly,

Twelfthly, You say, it's not true, that Christ never prayed for the wicked, for he made Intercession for his Enemies.

Reply. If it be not true, it does not at all reflect on me, for I never asserted it; you must charge the untruth on such as are guilty. My Assertion was this; *That he prayed not for the World, but for them that were given him of the Father*; some of which did believe, others should in time believe, and till they did I grant that they were Enemies unto Christ. He prayed not for the World, granted by your self, and yet he prayed for some that did not then believe, therefore such are considered distinct from the World, antecedent unto Faith. You say, he prayed for some that were wicked, and yet you grant he prayed not for the World, therefore those wicked ones must be considered distinct from the World whilst wicked ones.

I shall now offer one thing to your Consideration, and so pass from this Head. If Christ died for all, as you have here asserted, then none shall perish in their Sins.

First, Jesus Christ in dying did design to redeem from all Sins, not from a part, but from the whole, *Tit.* 2. 14. *Who gave himself for us, to redeem us from all Iniquity:* Either Christ did what he gave himself to do, or he did not: If he did, then are they discharged from all Sin, then there is nothing left to damn, for God damns none but for Sin; if he did not, it was for want of Merit in his Blood, and who dares charge this on Christ?

Secondly, He paid the full price, as much as Justice did require; he gave his Life a ransom, and that was all that was expected; he made his Soul an offering for Sin, upon the performance of which he had the Promise he should see his Seed, *Isa.* 53. 11. see them, that is, that he should see them delivered; he saw them in Bonds before, but now he should see them at Liberty.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, He did by that one offering obtain their discharge, *Heb.* 10. 14. Zech. 9. 11. *As for thee, by the Blood of thy Covenant have I sent forth thy Prisoners out of the pit wherein there was no Water.* There was not a Prisoner left behind for whom a ransom was paid by Christ.

Fourthly, That Redemption that Christ obtained was Eternal, they were never to return to bondage more, *Heb.* 9. 12. he entred once into the Holy Place; *having obtained eternal Redemption for us*; and now I hope, that to an impartial Eye, that will as well weigh what is said for, as what is said against the five Errors that you charge me with, will appear to be Gospel Truths, and such as wherein Free-Grace does abundantly shine out, and that the Elect only are the subjects of the new Covenant, which was the fourth Note of Distinction that I gave between this Covenant and that into which *Israel* entred with their Seed, *Deut.* 29. 10.

In the next place, you say, that there is one remarkable Note of difference between these two Covenants that you have past over, and that is, the Covenant of Grace is *A better Covenant, established on better Promises.* To this you say, you grant, that the Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant than the Ceremonial Law was, which was called the first Covenant, *Heb.* 8. from the *1st. verse* to the *8th.* but this doth not prove any difference between the Covenant of Grace and the Covenant made with the *Israelites*, Deut. 29.

Reply. First, The Apostle makes not the Comparison here between the Covenant of Grace and the Ceremonial Law, but between two Covenants properly considered; he calls them the first and the second Covenant. The first Covenant is distinct from the Ceremonial Law as well as the second, *Heb.* 9. 1. *Then verily that first Covenant had also Ordinances of Divine Worship*, &c. These Ordinances were appointed by the Ceremo-

nial

nial Law, they were but the adjuncts of the first Covenant; and the Ceremonial Law that is mentioned *Heb.* 8. 3, 4, 5. contains those very things that are called the Ordinances of the first Covenant, that are distinct from the Essence thereof; there was not one of these Ordinances appointed in fourteen Years after the Covenant was made, *Gen.* 15. 18. compared with *Gen.* 17. and some of them were not appointed in four hundred Years after.

Secondly, The Comparison lies not between Promises and Precepts, but between Promises and Promises; the Covenant of Grace is *established on better Promises*; here is the Promise of *writing the Law in the Heart, that all the subjects thereof shall know the Lord; that God will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more:* Produce such a Promise in that Covenant, *Deut.* 29. if you can. And these Promises are absolute, there is no Condition required of the subjects thereof entitling them thereunto. Had these Promises been in that Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, considered as such, they would have been as good in that as in this, and they should all have enjoyed the Benefit of them.

Secondly, You say, that though this Covenant under the Law was clouded with Mosaical Ceremonies annext to it, yet the Nature of it was not hereby changed.

Reply. It was the first Covenant that had the Mosaical Ceremonies annext to it, (as I have shewed you already) *Heb.* 9. 1. now this first Covenant was distinct from the Covenant of Grace, between which and the second Covenant the Comparison lieth.

Thirdly, You say, the Prophets did sometimes declare the spiritual Promises thereof, and the wisest among the *Jews* did discern the spiritual Blessings contained in them, and the Moral Duties injoined by it, to be the greatest and the most principal. *Reply.*

Reply. First, That the Prophets declared the ſpiritual Bleſſings of this Covenant, I grant; and that there were ſome amongſt the *Jews* that did diſcern them to be the greateſt Bleſſings; but had this been the Covenant into which the natural Seed were taken, they would all have had a ſight of them. The Promiſe is, *They ſhall all know the Lord, from the leaſt to the greateſt of them.*

Secondly, I would enquire, How it appears that the Moral Duties were preſcribed by the Covenant of Grace? That Moral Duties compared with Ceremonial are the greateſt, I grant, but that they are preſcribed by the Covenant of Grace, I deny.

SECT. X.

YOU ſay, the next thing debated was, Whether this Covenant into which the *Jews* entered, be repealed, and Childrens Church-memberſhip be aboliſhed, or no? And whereas I attempted, in my firſt Reply, to prove that it was made void by the Death of Chriſt, you returned this Anſwer, That this Covenant being the Covenant of Grace, it was not then aboliſhed, but only the Ceremonial Law, which is ſometimes called the firſt and old Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 7, 8, 13. but inſtead of giving you a ſatisfactory Anſwer, I did Nicely diſtinguiſh between the firſt Covenant and the Ordinances thereof; and that I then took a great deal of needleſs pains, to ſhew in what reſpects this Covenant was faulty, and in what not.

Reply. First, What I ſpoke in that Nice Diſtinction, (as you call it) ſhewing in what reſpects the firſt Covenant was faulty, and in what not, is but poorly anſwered by a bare recital thereof, without one Word of Reply to it. I ſhould have thought, that a Nice Diſtinction ſhould have been taken into Conſideration, ſo far as to have ſhewn the Nicety and the Unſoundneſs thereof,

thereof, but seeing you have returned no Answer to it, I conclude that the Distinction stands good, that they were not the Ordinances, but the Covenant it self that was faulty.

Secondly, You say, I tell you at last, that the Covenant *Deut.* 29. is clearly distinguished from the Covenant of Grace by this Mark, that it was the Covenant that God made with them when he brought them up out of the Land of *Egypt*, *Deut.* 29. 25. compared with *Jer.* 31, 32, 33. You say, you have well considered those Scriptures, and you can't find that these were two Covenants, and that you have already proved, *Sect.* 8. *pag.* 41. that it's the same Covenant with that *Gen.* 17. 7. *Heb.* 8. 10. *Jer.* 31, 33.

Reply. What proof was then offered was again disproved in my Reply, wherein I shewed you the vast difference there is between the Tenor of these two Covenants.

Thirdly, You say, that Covenant into which the *Jews* entred with their seed contained Spiritual Blessings, and the Precepts of it were written in their Hearts, *Deut.* 30. 6, 14. compared with *Rom.* 10. 8.

Reply. I have already answered the first part of this Objection, and disproved it.

Secondly, I deny, that the Laws of the Covenant of Grace were written in their Hearts; or that there was any Law written in their Hearts by vertue of this Covenant. *First*, The word *Written* is not in the Text, nor is the sense of the Word there to be found. *Secondly*, That which is called the Law, *Deut.* 30. 12. is called Christ, *Rom.* 10. 1. I do not think it proper to say, that Christ was written in their Hearts. *Thirdly*, If the Law was written in their Hearts, it must be there as a ruling Law, or as a Dispositive Law: Not as a ruling Law, in that sense there was no Law written in the heart since *Adam*'s fall, and it was only the Moral

Law

Law that was so written, antecedent to that fall: If it were there as a Dispositive Law, then were all their sins pardoned: He that hath promised the one, hath promised the other, and both absolutely, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. Shew me a Person in whose heart the Law of God is written, by vertue of this Covenant, and I will shew you a person whose sins are pardoned. All that can be gathered from these two places, is, that Christ is brought nigh to a people by the Gospel; and to grasp after more, is to reach after that which these Scriptures will not afford.

Fourthly, You say, this Covenant was not first made with the *Jews* when they came up out of *Egypt*, it was first made with *Abraham* and his seed, and only renewed with the *Jews* at the Land of *Moab*.

Reply. I grant it, yet is that renewing called the making of the Covenant; and in that you grant it to be the same Covenant which that Mark refers to that you have in the 25*th.* verse, it is clear it was not the Covenant of Grace.

Fifthly, You say, that Covenant that was made with *Israel* when they came up out of *Egypt*, was no other but the *Mosaical* Law, as appears *Heb.* 8. from the 1*st.* to the 8*th.*

Reply. First, If the Covenant that was made with *Israel* when they came up out of *Egypt*, was no other than the *Mosaical Law*, then that Covenant *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. was no other than the *Mosaical Law*; for that was the Covenant that God made with them when they came up out of *Egypt*, as appears by the 25*th. verse*; and you confess your self, that the *Mosaical Law* is distinct from the Covenant of Grace, and that it is repealed, therefore that Covenant is then repealed.

Secondly, I deny, that the Covenant that God made with them when they came up out of *Egypt*, was no other but the *Mosaical Law*. You will find *Deut.* 29. 1. that

that it was according to all the Words that were ſpoken in the 28*th. Chapter*, that he was to make the Covenant with the Children of *Iſrael* in the Land of *Moab*, which was the Covenant that he made with them *ver.* 10, 11, 12, 13. Now there is more contained in the 28*th. Chapter* than the *Moſaical Law*; there are a great many outward Bleſſings that are promiſed on condition of their Obedience, from *ver.* 2, to 15. among which there is their Proſperity promiſed in the Land of *Canaan*, which was the Land that the Lord promiſed to give them, *verſe* 11. now this Land was the Inheritance of the firſt Covenant, *Gen.* 15. 18. God never renewed this Covenant with them after he then made it with *Abraham*, but he ſtill mentions the Land of *Canaan*, as you may ſee *Gen.* 17. 8. *Exod.* 23. from 22, to the end, and *Deut.* 28. 12.

Thirdly, There were a great many Curſes threatned in caſe of Diſobedience, *Deut.* 28. from 15, to the end, and theſe are called the Curſes of the Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 20, 21. Thoſe Legal Ceremonial Laws that you refer to, *Heb.* 8. and the beginning, are the things which are called the Ordinances of the firſt Covenant, *Heb.* 9. 1. which were annext after the firſt Covenant was made, *Gen.* 15. 18.

Fourthly, You ſay, that this Covenant is delivered in one continued Speech, *Chap.* 29. 30.

Reply. If it be granted without proof, that the 29*th.* and 30*th. Chapters* were delivered at one continued Speech, yet it will not follow, that what is ſpoken in both theſe *Chapters*, do all of it reſpect that Covenant mentioned in *Chap.* 29. 10, 11. I doubt not but *Jer.* 31. was delivered at one continued Speech, and yet there are two Covenants ſpoken of, *ver.* 31, 32, 33.

Secondly, I deny, that Heart-circumciſion promiſed *Deut.* 30. 6. is a Branch of that Covenant, *Deut.* 29. 10. or that it belonged to all the Natural Seed, who

were

were the ſubjects of the firſt Covenant: I would now Query, Whether the Curſes that are threatned *Deut.* 29. 20, 21. be not the Curſes of that ſame Covenant mentioned *ver.* 10, 11?

Secondly, Whether theſe Curſes be not threatned in caſe they brake that ſame Covenant? And if both of theſe be granted, it will neceſſarily follow that it is the ſame Covenant that is intended *ver.* 25. where the reaſon is rendered why the Lord laid all theſe Curſes upon them; and if ſo, it may ſtill be diſtinguiſhed by this ſame mark from the Covenant of Grace.

Again, If it were only the *Moſaical Law* that was repealed, how then came Circumciſion to be repealed, that was the Token of that Covenant that God made with *Abraham* and the Natural Seed, *Gen.* 17. 10? This was no Moſaical Rite in reſpect of the firſt inſtitution. All the *Moſaical Law* might have been repealed, and Circumciſion have remained; but the Repeal of the Covenant, whereof Circumciſion was the ſign, made void the Token.

Again, If it was only the *Moſaical Law* that was repealed, how came the *Jewiſh* Church-State to be repealed and diſſolved, when Chriſt was offered up? you ſay, it was by vertue of Covenant that they were conſtituted a Church, by vertue of Intereſt in that Covenant that their Children were Church-members, yet you grant that their Church-ſtate was diſſolved when Chriſt was offered up; and that the *Jews* themſelves were to be conſidered as Aliens, till they embraced the Chriſtian Faith. If the Covenant, by vertue of which they were conſtituted a Church, had remained, their Church-ſtate would have remained; that which gave it its being, would have continued it its being: The Repeal of *Moſes*'s Law would not have made void their Church-ſtate, had not the Covenant been repealed: Now that the Covenant it ſelf, in which all the people of *Iſrael* ſtood,

ſtood, was repealed, when Chriſt was offered up is as clear as Words at length can make it, *Zach.* 11. 10. *Then I took my ſtaff, even Beauty, and cut it aſunder, that I might break my Covenant that I had made with all the people, and it was broken in that day.* Dr. *Owen* obſerves upon the place, "That when the Covenant of Grace was con-"firmed by the death of Chriſt, that then was the pe-"culiar Covenant that God made with *Iſrael* broken, "and *Iſrael* ceaſed to be a Church.

In your next Paragraph you ſay I tell you, that ſeeing the Legal Ordinances are repealed, and a New Adminiſtration of the Covenant of Grace is eſtabliſhed, the Church-memberſhip of Children muſt be proved by this New Adminiſtration, and not by the Old, which is aboliſhed; for in the change of the Adminiſtration there is a change of the Conſtitution: The Church was National under the Law, it's Congregational under the Goſpel. To this you ſay, that though the Legal Adminiſtration be aboliſhed, yet the Covenant is the ſame, and the Priviledges of Believers in ſpiritual things is rather greater than leſſer under the Goſpel.

Reply. That the Covenant of Grace remains, is granted, that the Peculiar Covenant that God made with the *Jews* remains, is denied: If the Covenant by which they were conſtituted a Church had remained, their Church-ſtate would have remained, but their Church-ſtate is diſſolved, granted by your ſelf, therefore the Covenant by which they held their Church-ſtate is diſſolved.

Secondly, That the Priviledges of Believers in ſpiritual things are not leſſened, is granted, but what is that to their Children that are not Believers? that Believers are Church-members, none denies; the Queſtion is, Whether their Children that do not believe are ſo or no?

Secondly, You ſay, that by vertue of the Covenant

of Grace, the Children of Believers have a Right to Church-membership.

Reply. First, I have but your bare *ſay ſo* for this, neither Scripture nor Argument to prove it, and my bare denial is of as good Authority.

Secondly, I proved, that the matter of a Goſpel-Church was viſible Saints, ſuch as in the judgment of Charity were inherently holy, among the number of which Children can't be reckoned: I told you alſo, if you could produce but one Infant that ever was a Member of any one Goſpel-Church, I would give you the Cauſe; but theſe things you never replied to.

Thirdly, You ſay, That the Church under the Goſpel is not only Congregational; for tho' a Congregation of Chriſtians under the Goſpel may rightly be called a Church, yet many ſuch Churches by the Apoſtles Authority were united under one Head; *Timothy* was ordained the firſt Biſhop of *Epheſus*, as the *Poſtſcript* declares in 2 *Tim.* and it's evident he had the Government of ſeveral Congregational Churches, becauſe he is required to have inſpection over other Paſtors, and to charge ſome that they teach no other Doctrine, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. And *Titus* was ordained the firſt Biſhop of the Church of the *Cretians*, as appears by the Poſtſcript, and was left by *Paul* to ordain Elders in every City: And the Angels of the Seven Churches of *Aſia* were ſingle Perſons, and had Rule over *Preſbyters*.

Reply. First, If it were granted, that many ſuch Congregational Churches were by the Apoſtolical Power united under one Head, it would not relieve you, neither on one hand nor on the other, you could no ſooner prove that Children were Members under the New-Adminiſtration than before: If you can't produce one Child in ten Congregations ſingly conſidered, then you can't

can't produce one in the same Congregations collectively considered.

Secondly, If this were granted, yet it cannot be denied but that the constitution of the Church is altered, and still there is a plurality of Churches under the Gospel; whereas the Church was National under the Legal Dispensation, and if altered in any thing, it's by vertue of this New-Dispensation, and that shews that we must now take our measures from thence; and if we will prove Childrens Church-Membership under the Gospel, it must be done by the Law of the New-Dispensation, or we do nothing.

Secondly, I deny, that many such Churches were by the Apostolical Power united under one Head, and therefore shall in the next place examine your proofs. Your first Instance is of *Timothy* ordained the first Bishop of *Ephesus*, and you prove it by the Postscript.

Reply. *First*, I Question the Authority of this Postscript, and that for these Reasons: *First*, I do not find it in all Translations; if it were of Divine Authority, I wonder it should be left out. *Secondly*, The Postscript to that which we call the *first Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, tells us it was the first, when it appears *Chap*. 5. 9. that it was the second, therefore I look upon these Postscripts to be Humane.

Secondly, If I grant the Authority of them, it will stand you in little stead: For, *First*, The Church of *Ephesus* was but one single Congregation, produce a plurality if you can. *Secondly*, He was ordained by Election, not made and imposed upon them by any Apostolical Power, he was chosen by the People.

Thirdly, A Bishop and an Elder is the same thing, *Tit*. 1. 5. compared with the *7th*.

Fourthly, It doth not appear from 1 *Tim*. 1. 3. that *Timothy* had an inspection over other Pastors, in that

he was to charge ſome that they ſhould teach no other Doctrine. For,

Firſt, You do not know that theſe were Paſtors teaching or preaching, not being tyed to Office-Power; the Members might teach as well as Paſtors, they might all propheſie one by one: Propheſying is a ſpeaking to Edification, Exhortation and Conſolation, 1 *Cor.* 12. *Many of the Brethren in the Lord waxed bold to preach the Goſpel by my Bonds*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Phil.* 1. 14, 15, 16. *As every man hath received a gift, ſo let him miniſter the ſame, as good Stewards of the manifold Graces of God: He that ſpeaks, let him ſpeak as the Oracles of God*, 1 Pet. 4. 10.

Secondly, If it be granted that they were Paſtors, yet what power does there appear in *Timothy* over them by this Scripture, more than was in the Members of the Church of *Coloſs* over *Archippus*, Coloſ. 4. *Say to Archippus, that he take heed to his Miniſtry that he hath received, to fulfill it.*

Fifthly, There was a plurality of Biſhops or Elders in *Epheſus*, though *Epheſus* was but one Congregation or Church, *Acts* 20. *He ſent and called for the Elders of the Church of Epheſus, and gave them a charge to feed the flock of God over the which the Holy Ghoſt had made them Overſeers.* The Church of *Epheſus* was but one flock, and each of theſe Elders was an Overſeer of the whole flock; they had equally the overſight of them, and it doth not appear that here was any Superintendent, Primate, or chief among them.

Your ſecond Inſtance is *Titus*, and his power hath but a Poſtſcript for it neither.

Reply. What I have ſaid of *Timothy* with reſpect to the Poſtſcript you may read over again, and let it ſerve for an anſwer here.

Secondly, You ſay, he was to ordain Elders in every City.

Reply. Firſt, If *Titus* were ordained an Elder of a particular

ticular Church in *Crete*, it was by Election, which shews the power of ordination lay in the Church, not in Ministers; and what power there is in one Church is in another: Now we may not suppose that *Paul* who never attempted to take the power of the Church from them himself, would give *Titus* a Power so to do; he gave him Rules to observe; *That thou shouldst ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee: Titus* was left there to be of use by way of advice and counsel to them, to acquaint them with the Rules that were to be observed by them in the Organizing of Churches, but not to exercise a Monarchical Power over them.

Secondly, The ordination of an Elder is not the Act of a Particular Person, but of the whole Church, therefore *Titus* had not this Power in himself, *Acts* 14. 23. *When they had ordained them Elders in all the Churches by election*, &c. *Not by laying on of hands, but by lifting up of hands*, (as *Cartwright* observes on the place in answer to the *Rhemists*) *it was by common suffrage; the essence of Ordination lieth in the choice of the people, and the acceptation of that choice. Beza* notes on the place, *That in the Primitive Times Ministers were not made, and thrust upon the people through Bribery or Lordly Superiority, but chose by the common suffrage of the people:* Each particular Congregation is invested with full power for the right ordering of themselves, *Mat.* 18.

Thirdly, *Titus* was an Evangelist, as it appears by his work; he was not long Resident in one place, and was only left at *Crete* for a season, to be an Assistant to them in this Work, no fixed Bishop over all the Churches in *Crete*.

Your third Instance is of the Angels, *Rev.* 2*d.* and 3*d.* Chapters, they were single Persons you say, and had the Rule over *Presbyters*.

Reply. First, That these were particular men I grant, and so were the Churches that they related to, particu-

lar Churches or Congregations; produce a plurality of Congregations in any one of these Churches if you can.

Secondly, These Angels were the Messengers of the Churches; so the word *Angels* signifie.

Thirdly, You can't produce one instance in these two *Chapters*, that these Angels had rule over *Presbyters*; for what is contained in these Epistles is spoken to the Churches, both by way of commendation, and by way of reproof, and not to the Angels distinct from the Churches; what the Spirit spake was to the Churches, though the Epistles were sent to the Angels: You can't say it was the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* only that had lost his first Love, unless you contradict your self, *page* 52. You say it is evident, that some of the Church of *Ephesus* fell, and were threatned unless they did repent; now the same that were here threatned, that were before commended, that had tried them, that had said they were Apostles, and were not, and had found them Lyars, *verse* 2. so that it was the Church that had this Inspection over the pretended Ministers, not the Angels distinct from the Church. And it was the Church of *Pergamos* that was reproved, in the 14*th*. *verse*, for suffering corrupt Teachers to remain there: Nor are you ever able to prove that these corrupt Teachers had Office-power committed to them. If they had not, then these Angels had not rule over *Presbyters*; if they had, it was the Church, not the Angels singly considered, that had this ruling power; if the neglect had been the Angels, not the Churches, the Church would not have been reproved for the Angels fault.

In the next place you say I tell you, that the only Commission the Apostles had from Christ was to make Disciples by Instruction, and then to Baptize them; to this you say, that Christ commissioned them to baptize all that were discipled, and that Infants of Believers are

in

in some sense Disciples, because God is pleased to take them into Covenant.

Reply. First, You granted in your last, that the chief Commission that the Apostles had from Christ, was, to make Disciples by Instruction, and then to baptize them: Upon which I desired you to shew me another, if this were not the only Commission that Christ gave them: Now because you can't find another, but must grant that this was the only Commision they acted by, you have left out the word Instruction, which you had granted before; but this will not do your Business.

Secondly, To be discipled by Instruction, and to be a Disciple of Christ, is the same thing; a Person can't be a Disciple of Christ unless he be taught. Can a Person be a Disciple of Christ unless he hath learned Christ? If you did not know that a Disciple and a Scholar were the same thing, the Opposition you make against it were the more tolerable: You can't define a Disciple of Christ, but you must say, he is one that hath learned Christ. *Calvin*, that was no Friend to the Perswasion of the *Baptists*, saith in the 3*d*. Book of his *Institutions*, *Chap.* 2. *Sect.* 6. that the Apostle doth commonly use the words *Faithful* and *Disciple*, as several Words expressing the same thing; and *Wilson* in his Dictionary tells you, the Word *Disciple* signifies a Scholar, without giving any other sense of it; nor did I ever meet with any other sense of the Word, unless the point of Baptism were in debate, and then I confess Men will shift and strain the Word strangely, (as you do) to bring in Children to be Disciples, though they know they are uncapable of learning Christ.

Secondly, The Apostles had no Commission to baptize any but such as were discipled by Instruction: The Commission is, *Go disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them*; the word *Them* is relative to all Nations discipled.

Thirdly, I deny, that Infants are discipled in any sense, and it seems you don't know your self in what sense they are Disciples; you say, they are so in some sense, but do not tell me in what. In what sense I pray is he a Scholar that never learned, that never went to School to learn, that is not capable of Learning.

Secondly, You say, that though you grant that Aliens from the Faith must be discipled before they be baptized, yet you can't see how all Infants are hereby excluded.

Reply. The same Commission that expresly enjoyns them to Baptize the former, doth implicitely and consequentially forbid them to Baptize the latter. I would but ask, Whether Christ, when he doth expresly command them to teach baptized ones to observe all things whatsoever he hath commanded them, hath not in the same command implicitely and consequentially forbidden them to teach them to observe that which he hath not commanded them.

Thirdly, You say, that the Children of Believers are born within the Covenant, and so ought to be baptized before they are capable of Instruction.

Reply. First, You do but beg the Question to say they are born within the Covenant, that's the thing denied by me, and not proved by you.

Secondly, I deny, that barely Interest in the Covenant is the ground of Baptism; there is nothing that you pitch upon to prop up Infant-Baptism withal, that you have any expres Scripture to prove it by; if you say, they are in the Covenant, that must be proved by consequence; if you say, that Interest in the Covenant is the ground of Baptism, that must be proved by consequence; and whatever else you make the ground of it, must be proved the same way; and so you are still left upon uncertainties your selves, and from mistaken

pre-

premiſes you draw wrong Concluſions. Nothing can certainly be made the ground of Baptiſm but the command of Chriſt, keep to that and you are upon a ſure Foundation, and if you keep to that, you will never Baptize any but ſuch as are diſcipled by the Word.

SECT. XI.

YOU come now you ſay to Vindicate your Arguments for Infant-baptiſm againſt my Exceptions. Your firſt Argument is drawn from *Acts* 2.39. This you ſay is ſtrongly aſſaulted with many Engins of Battery. *Firſt*, I argue thus, that what right the Children are here ſaid to have, they had before their Parents did believe. In Anſwer to this, you ſay, the Promiſe was propoſed to the *Jews*, to encourage them *to believe, and to repent*; and if they would lay hold on the Promiſe, and become Diſciples, that then they ſhould gain an Advantage to their Children; for the Promiſe was offered to them on Condition that they would embrace Chriſtianity, but they had no actual right to it till they did believe; and though the Promiſe was propoſed to the *Jews* whilſt Unbelievers, yet an Argument may be drawn from it to prove a Priviledge to Believers and their Children.

Reply. Firſt, Here is a grant, that the *Jews* were not Believers when the Promiſe was propoſed to them; by which I perceive that my Engines of Battery were not raiſed in vain, the main Fort is beaten down, and the ſtrongeſt hold that ever Infant-baptiſm had is now demoliſhed. No Argument can be drawn to prove a Priviledge to Believers and their Children, from what is ſpoken to Unbelievers.

Secondly, Grant this, and you muſt neceſſarily grant the other, that what right the Children are here ſaid to have, they had before their Parents did believe; *The Promiſe is to you, and to your Children*; this was antecedent to their Faith. *Thirdly*,

Thirdly, I deny, that the offer of the Promise was on Condition, that they would embrace Christianity: For, *First*, Had the Parents refused to embrace Christianity, that had not blockt up the way of the Children; the advantage or disadvantage of the Children did not depend on their Parents receiving or rejecting; the Children had the offer as well as the Parents.

Secondly, Those that never did receive it had the offer as well as those that did; nothing can be more free than the offer of the Promise.

Thirdly, There is no assurance given in the Text, that such as did embrace Christianity should gain an advantage to their Children; what the Promise was to the Parents before they did believe, that it was to their Children before they did believe; that is, they both had the offer of it, and the Children had no more after their Parents did believe, by vertue of their Parents Faith, than they had before. I would now Query, What advantage the Parent gained for his Children by embracing of the Christian Faith? If you say, it was Baptism, I must desire you to prove it too as well as say so; if you say, it was an Interest in the Promise, by vertue of which they had a right to Baptism, then I shall desire proof to both, for neither of them is founded on the Text.

Secondly, I would Query, Whether they gained an advantage for all their Children, or but for a part of them? If you say, for all, then for the Adult as well as for their Infants, then had they an Interest in the Promise, and a right to Baptism, though they remain'd profest Pagans, or continued Aliens, denying *Jesus of Nazareth*; and this is contrary to your own Principles. If you say, they gained an advantage for their Infants only, then you will be to seek for proof for this distinction; nay, the Text will contradict you, for their Children are indefinitely considered. *Secondly*, This would

would not reach the Case, they had said but just before, *His Blood be upon us, and upon our Children*; the Apostle now applies a Plaister as large as the Sore; *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*; as if he had said, though you have imprecated his Blood on your own, and the Heads of your Children, yet have you and your Children the tender of the Promise.

Secondly, You say, though the Promise was proposed to the *Jews* whilst Unbelievers, yet an Argument may be drawn thus, the offering of a Promise to the Wicked doth not make it ineffectual to the Righteous; though the Gospel be preached to the Wicked that reject it, yet such as believe and obey the Gospel may reap Benefit by it.

Reply. I grant it, but here is no Argument in this to prove an advantage to more than do believe: What is all this to Infants that do not believe, nor are any wise capable so to do? could I have argued no better, I would have let this alone; and now I say again, that no Argument can be drawn to prove a Priviledge to Believers and their Seed, from what is spoken to Unbelievers. Should I say, the Promise is to Believers and their Children, and no more, and bring this Text to prove it, you would turn this Text against me, to prove that the Promise is to Unbelievers and their Children, and what Reply have I then to make?

Secondly, You say, I tell you, that if the Children of Believers have an Interest in the Promise, they shall then enjoy the good of the Promise, for Interest in the Promise can't be lost. You say, if this baffled Argument were of any force, many grown Persons as well as Children that profess the true Faith, would have no Interest in the Promise.

Reply. The Argument has not yet been baffled, and I think it will not for the future; the Apostle tells us, *Rom.* 9. that it cannot be, *That the Word of God should have*

have taken none effect; the Promise can't fail those that have an Interest in it; the Promise is not Yea and Nay, but *Yea* and *Amen*; the Reason why some of *Israel* went without the Benefit of it, was, because they had no Interest in it; the Promise was made to *Israel*, *But all were not Israel that were of Israel.* A new Heart is absolutely promised to those that have an Interest in the Promise, *That God will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more*; how then can they go without the Benefit of? Did these Promises hang on Conditions, it were something, but that they do not; you grant your self, that the change of the Heart is absolutely promised.

Secondly, I grant, that many grown Persons, that profess the true Faith, have no Interest in the Promise: This runs me upon no absurdity; there are many Hypocrites that profess the true Faith. The foolish Virgins professed the same Faith that the wise did; it's not the Profession of Christ, but Relation unto Christ, that is the ground of Interest in the Promise; *If ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to Promise.* It is not the Profession of the true Faith that is the Evidence of Interest in the Promise, but Faith it self.

Thirdly, You say, that all that have an Interest in the Covenant, in regard of external Priviledges, may not enjoy the saving Benefits thereof, because they prove false to the Covenant, and Apostatize from it.

Reply. The Question was not about those that have an Interest in the Covenant, in regard of external Priviledges, (though I know no such Interest singly considered; he that hath an Interest in the Covenant of Grace, hath a Right and Title to all the good of it, Grace here, and Glory hereafter.) The Question is, about those that have an Interest in the Promise, and that I keep to, such shall not fail of the Benefit of it; the

the Promise is absolute, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *Secondly*, Such as have an Interest in the Promise, are by the same Promise secured against Apostacy, *Jer.* 32. 40.

Fourthly, You say, that God will not fail on his part, to give us Grace sufficiently to enable us to keep his Covenant; but we on our part may fail of our Duty, and so fall short of true Happiness.

Reply. Will he give us true Faith? or will he not? If he will not, then he will not afford us Grace sufficiently to enable us to keep his Covenant; *For without Faith it's impossible to please God.* If he will, then its impossible for us to fall short of true Happiness: *He that believeth shall not perish, but have Everlasting Life.* Every Believer hath his Sins pardoned, *Acts* 13. 39. every Believer *shall be saved*, Mark 16. 16.

Fifthly, You say, I tell you, the Promise is not proposed here as the ground of Baptism, but as a Motive to enforce the Exhortation, *to repent and be Baptized.* To this you say, the same thing may be a Motive and a Ground too, in several respects; the Promise of Eternal Life is a Motive to Obedience and Holiness, and when we are Holy it's the ground of our Hope: So the Promise here was a Motive to encourage the *Jews* to believe and to embrace the Gospel, and when they did believe, it was the ground of Baptism.

Reply. First, Should I grant you all this, you would be no gainer by the Bargain, for Persons must believe before the Promise here becomes the ground of Baptism; so that you your self have left no room for Children to come in upon this ground; it is only a Motive to them to believe and obey the Gospel, and no ground to be baptized upon, till they do believe.

Secondly, The offer of the Promise was never made the ground of Baptism, no instance can be given of it; wherever the Gospel comes, there comes the offer of the Promise; those that did not repent, had the offer

of

of the Promise as well as those that did; but if the offer of the Promise had been the ground of Baptism, then had they a right to it as well as others.

Thirdly, It was the command that was the ground of Baptism; when they had embraced the Promise, and not their Interest in the Promise, the Precept was, *repent and be baptized*; and that was the ground why Penitent ones took up the Ordinance.

Fourthly, Your instance that you bring to prove, that the same thing may be both a Motive and a Ground too in several respects, is not much to the Purpose; you should have brought an instance of that which was a Motive to, and the ground of the same thing; and for want of that, you brought an instance of that which was a Motive to one thing, and the Ground of another, a Motive to Holiness, and the Ground of Hope.

Sixthly, You say, I tell you, that the Children were not baptized when their Parents were, because they were not capable of receiving the Word. To this you say, *First*, If the Promise belonged to them, then Baptism appertained to them; and though they were not capable of receiving the Word, yet this did not render them unfit for Baptism.

Reply. You grant but just before, that the Promise was but a Motive to encourage to believe, not the Ground of Baptism, till they did believe; whence I conclude, the Promise belonged to the Children no otherwise than as a Motive, not as the Ground of Baptism, because the Children did not believe.

Secondly, The Faith of the Parent gave not a right to the Promise unto the Child, what right the Child had bore date before the Parent did believe; *The Promise is to you, and to your Children*; this was before the Parent did believe, granted by your self, and there is not a word spoken of Children after the Parents believed.

Secondly, You say, it does not follow that the Children

dren were not Baptized when their Parents were, becauſe it is not recorded; there is no doubt but the Apoſtles were baptized, yet there is no Record when and where it was done.

Reply. I grant, if there were no more to be ſaid in the Caſe but barely the want of a Record, it were not ground enough to conclude it; but there is more to be ſaid in it: For, *Firſt*, There were no more baptized than were added to the Church; that I ſuppoſe you will grant me. *Secondly*, There were no more added to the Church than were admitted unto the Supper; *The ſame day there was added unto them about three thouſand Souls, and they continued in the Apoſtles Doctrine, and breaking of Bread, and Prayer.* If there were no more Baptized than were added to the Church, and admitted unto all the Ordinances, then their Children were not Baptized; but there were no more baptized than were added to the Church, and admitted unto all the Ordinances, therefore their Children were not then baptized.

Your ſecond Argument, you ſay, was drawn from the right the Jewiſh Children had to be admitted into the Church-ſtate: To which I replied, that the Law of that Church-ſtate being repealed, and a new Adminiſtration eſtabliſhed, we muſt not now take our meaſures from thence. To this you ſay, though the Adminiſtration be different under the Law and Goſpel, yet the Covenant is the ſame.

Reply. The Queſtion was not about the Covenant, but about Church-memberſhip; now the Adminiſtration being changed, in which there is a change of the Conſtitution of the Church from National to Congregational, you muſt prove their Church-memberſhip from the Law of this New Diſpenſation, or you do nothing: *Old things are paſſed away, behold all things are become new*, 2 Cor. 5. and ſo great is the change, that Birth-

Birth-Priviledges are ceas'd, and a Son of *Abraham* according to the Flesh hath no more notice taken of him than a Stranger. You your self grant the *Jews* to be Aliens as well as others, till they believe; a *Jew* that under the Old Administration was born a Church-member, under the New is not to be lookt on as such, till in the Judgment of Charity he be New-born, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. seeing you can give me no instance of one Child that ever was received a member of any one Church, since the change of the Administration, I shall pass from this Head, as judging it a needless task to answer those Arguments that have been answered already.

Secondly, You say you urged this for Infant-Baptism, that if the Children of Christians are excluded the Covenant and Church of God, then they are in a worse Condition than the Children of the *Jews* were under the Law; and which is more absurd, they would have no more Priviledge than the Children of *Turks* and *Pagans*. To this you say I replied, that Interest in the Covenant of Grace is the same now as then it was; and though Children are not now admitted Members, yet have they the Benefit of the Word as then they had. But here you say the first clause is very obscure, and if I mean by it, as you think I do, that some Children are elected under the Gospel as well as under the Law, this is nothing to the purpose.

Reply. First, I mean as you think. *Secondly*, It's much to the purpose, for I can assure you, that none but the Elect then, nor now are, or were the subjects of that Covenant; for none but the Elect are given to Jesus Christ, and such only as are given to him are the subjects of this Covenant. As for the last Clause, that they have the Word allowed them, you acknowledge that a Priviledge to those that are capable of receiving it, but it can be none to Infants that are uncapable of it.

Reply.

Reply. When the Question was put, What Profit hath the *Jew* more than the *Gentile?* The Answer was, much every way, but chiefly, because to them were committed the Oracles of God; and though Children are uncapable of receiving the Word in an Infant-state, yet are they in a fairer way to receive Benefit by it than the Children of *Turks* and *Pagans*, to whom the Word is not vouchsafed.

Secondly, I know not why it should be look'd on as an absurdity, to say they have no more Priviledge than the Children of *Turks* or *Heathens* in an Infant-state, or how does the Lord become more bound to them than to these?

Thirdly, You say I tell you, that the Priviledge of Church-membership is taken from them under the Gospel, though the Jewish Infants enjoyed it, which is a thing that Infants are capable of.

Reply. First, I deny that Infants are capable of Church-membership under the Gospel, though they were under the Law. *First*, They are not fit Matter: The Matter of an instituted Church are visible Saints, such as in the Judgment of Charity are inherently Holy. *Secondly*, They are not capable of the form, which is mutual Consent. *Thirdly*, They are not capable of answering the ends of Church-Communion. *Fourthly*, The Jewish Infants are as capable of enjoying it now as the Infants of Christians; and yet you grant, its taken away from them; you your self would not admit them.

Fourthly, You say, that according to this Doctrine the Children of Christians are worsted by Christs coming, and it had been better for them to have been born under the Law.

Reply. You may as well say, that the Children of the *Jews* were worsted by Christs coming; for before that they were Church-members, but as soon as Christ was offered up, their Church-state ceas'd; (granted by

your self) Father and Child were unchurched together, and had the Children of Christians been born under the Law, their Church-membership would have ceas'd when Christ was offered up, as that of the Children of the *Jews* did.

Fifthly, You say, unless I could have answered this better, it had been my Wisdom to have past it over in silence, and that an ingenious Antagonist should acknowledge his Error.

Reply. First, As to the Answer that I have given, standers by may better Judge than you or I that are concerned. *Secondly*, If passing things in silence be the way for a Man to shew his Wisdom, you have in your Answer to mine shewn your Wisdom abundantly. *Thirdly*, There is nothing of ingenuity in acknowledging an Error antecedent to Conviction.

Sixthly, You say, that the little Cavil that I make about the Passover avails me nothing, and unless I could prove that Infants are qualified to receive it, it's a Vanity to argue for the probability of it.

Reply. First, Did you prove that Children were qualified for Baptism according to Institution, before you offered the same Argument to prove the probability of their Admission? or could you prove that there was one Infant in all those Households that were baptized? if not, it was a double Vanity for you to uge it.

Secondly, I know no qualification that was required of Infants to partake of the Passover, (being circumcised antecedent thereunto) but a capacity of eating Flesh; *It was a Lamb for a House, according to its eating*, Exod. 12. 4. Now it's easie to prove that there were Children in the House, that the whole House was to eat thereof, and that Children in an Infant-state were capable of eating Flesh; and the Argument is your own, *Book* 2. *Page* 29. that whole Households were baptized, and that Children are a part of the Household. I say,

the

the Houſhold were to eat the Paſſover, and that Children are a part of the Houſhold; and now methinks an ingenious Antagoniſt ſhould not refuſe his own Argument when turned againſt him.

You ſay your laſt Argument for Infant-baptiſm was this, that if the Infants of Believers be not Church-members, nor any way in Covenant with God, How then could they be in any State of Salvation? But there is good ground to hope, that the Children of Believers may be ſaved; *For of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* To this you ſay, I Reply, that ſome Children are in Covenant with God and in a State of Salvation, is granted; but what Children they are, is not known. You ſay, if I mean by this, that ſome Children are elected, this is impertinent; for the Covenant of Grace is not the Decree of Election, nor are all the ſubjects of that Covenant elected.

Reply. When I ſay ſome Children are in the Covenant, I mean as I ſay; they are in the Covenant, they had their Names written there *from the Foundation of the World. Secondly,* Such Infants as are in the Covenant, they are elected, and being elected they are given unto Jeſus Chriſt. *Thine they were, and thou gaveſt them unto me, and all mine are thine, and thine are mine,* John 17.6. The ſame individual Perſons that are the Fathers by Election, they are the Sons by Fœderal Relation. *Thirdly,* Thoſe only that are given to Jeſus Chriſt are the ſubjects of this Covenant, *Gal.* 3.29. *Fourthly,* Theſe whilſt in an Infant-ſtate are unknown to us. *Fifthly,* If they are not elected, they can't be ſaved, dying in their infancy, granted by your ſelf. You ſay, that none but the elect, or faithful perſevering Chriſtians, ſhall inherit Eternal Life; you can have no more hopes of their Salvation, than you have of their Election.

Secondly, You ſay, the Queſtion was not, Whether Infants were elected? But whether they were in a viſible State of Salvation?

Reply. You have forgotten the ſtate of the Queſtion, though you repeated it juſt before; the Queſtion was, If the Children of Believers were not Church-members, nor any way in Covenant with God, How then could they be ſaved? Now ſome Children are Church-members, (that is, of the univerſal Church) and in Covenant with God, and ſo capable of Salvation, though they are not viſibly ſo.

Thirdly, You ſay, I ſeem to deny all Infants to be Members of the Church, and in a viſible ſtate of Salvation, which will hardly agree with our Saviours Aſſertion, *Mark* 10. 14. *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* To this you ſay I Reply, that Chriſt ſpeaks not here of the Children of Believers, but of Children indefinitely. *Secondly*, He doth not ſay, that all ſuch do belong to the Kingdom of God, But, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.* You ſay, that Chriſt ſpeaks of ſuch Children as were brought to him, and doubtleſs they were the Children of the *Jews.*

Reply. Grant that they were the Children of the *Jews*, yet it will not follow that they were the Children of Believers, conſidered as ſuch; he doth not ſay, that theſe Children do belong to the Kingdom of God, But, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of God*; intimating, that Infants are capable of Salvation as well as grown Perſons.

Fourthly, You ſay, that Chriſt did not exclude any ſuch Infants from the Church, but ſaith indefinitely, *Of ſuch is the Kingdom of God.*

Reply. The time was not then come, the Jewiſh Church, of which Children were a part, was not then demoliſhed. But *Secondly*, Why had you not replied to the ſecond part of my Anſwer, which was this, Chriſt did not ſay, that all ſuch belong *to the Kingdom of Heaven*, But, *of ſuch is the Kingdom of Heaven:* If you can't ſay, that all the Children of Believers ſhall be ſaved,

ved, then you can't say that they are in a visible way of Salvation, considered as such.

Fifthly, You say, that if the Kingdom of Heaven be made up of Infants as well as grown Persons, then they are in a visible State of Salvation; and if so, they must needs be members of the visible Church.

Reply. First, This Doctrine damns inevitably all the Children of *Jews* and *Pagans*, dying in their Infancy; for you grant, that they are no Members of the Visible Church; truly, I thought you had been more Catholick in your Charity towards Children, though you forbear to commit them to the Dust *in sure and certain hope of the Resurrection to Eternal Life*; if they dye unbaptized, if their capability of Salvation does necessarily infer their membership of the Visible Church, then none but such as are Members of the Visible Church can be saved, and consequently the Infants of all others must perish; and thus to exclude all the Infants of *Jews* and *Pagans* from Salvation, is to pry too far into the Secrets of the Almighty. And now give me leave to tell you, after all the Pains that you have taken to prove Childrens Church-membership, (which you can never do) could you have accomplished this task, you would have been as much to seek to prove their right to Baptism as before, Church-membership being not the ground thereof. *Christ* and *John* did not baptize Church-members, considered as such, but first made them Disciples, and then Baptized them, *John* 4. 1.

SECT. XII.

YOU say, that whereas you argued, that Baptism is the initial Sacrament, whereby we are solemnly admitted into the Church of God, and into the Covenant of God, and that it may rightly be called the Seal of the Covenant, against which I make several Exceptions,

tions; as, *First*, That Christ never ordained Baptism for the solemn entrance of Members into the Church. To this you say, that if the Apostles baptized Persons as soon as they were made Disciples, and none were admitted to Church-Communion till they were baptized, this seems to insinuate, that hereby they were initiated into the Church.

Reply. First, Such as were discipled to Christ by the Apostles, were Members of the universal Visible Church, antecedent to Baptism.

Secondly, Their Admission to Church-Communion is by a particular instituted Church, and this you grant is not by Baptism, *Page* 2.

You say my second Exception is this, that if Persons are in Covenant, and Church-members, before they are baptized, then they are not entred in by Baptism. To this you say, though Persons are reputed Church-members, and in Covenant before, yet it is no absurdity to say, they are entred in by Baptism.

Reply. My former Answer must be again repeated, if they were in Covenant, and Church-members before, then they are not entred in by Baptism; if they be entred in by Baptism, then they were not in before.

Secondly, You say, they were invisibly and before God in Covenant, and Members of the Church, before they were Baptized, but they are solemnly, and in the face of the Congregation admitted by Baptism.

Reply. I thought that you had pleaded all this while that Children had been visibly in Covenant, and visible Church-members, but now it seems it's quite another thing, they are invisibly such. But be it so, *First*, I would enquire, How you know that they are such? That you have not told me yet: That which is invisibly so, is out of your sight, or else it is not invisible. *Secondly*, If they are not visibly so, then you Baptize such as are not Members of the visible Church; to be Members.

bers of the visible Church, and not to be visibly such, is such a piece of Contradiction that I think none can unriddle so as to make sense of it; if the whole be visible, the parts are visible; that which is invisible is no part of the visible Church. Now visible Church-membership is no longer the ground of Baptism, but invisible.

Thirdly, You illustrate this by a simile, you Query, Whether it be not common among Men, to use some Ceremonies in admitting a Man to an Estate? The Title he hath to it is the ground of his Admission, but he is not legally invested till he be admitted according to the Custom of the Mannor.

Reply. First, I do not understand that the Custom of Mannors is founded upon the Word as their Rule: I suppose Customs of Mannors may differ in many things, and if so, they do not go by the same Rule. *Secondly*, I do not know why we should look to the Custom of the Mannor for Example in the admitting of Members: You say, the Title that a Man hath to an Estate is the ground of his Admission, whence I conclude, this Title must be visible; the Custom of the Mannor will never admit a Man to an Estate that hath no visible Title to it; so that your simile is impertinent. The Title that the Child hath is invisible, yet there are two things that may be inferr'd from hence: *First*, That Children are not Members of the Visible Church antecedent unto Baptism. *Secondly*, That the Goaler and the Eunuch were not admitted according to the Custom of the Mannor, because they were not solemnly received by Baptism in the Face of the Congregation.

Fourthly, You say I tell you, that there is no Scripture ground to call Baptism the Seal of the Covenant. To this you say, if Circumcision be called a Seal, why may not Baptism be called a Seal too, seeing it's a Sacrament of the same Covenant?

Reply. First, I deny, that ever Circumcision was called the Seal of the Covenant; it's said indeed, *That Abraham received the sign of Circumcision, the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith*; this Ordinance was blest to him for Confirmation, but as it was set to the Body of the People, it was never called the Seal of the Covenant; nor did it Seal that to all as it seal'd to *Abraham*; did it Seal the Righteousness of Faith to them that never believed?

Secondly, It sealed that to *Abraham* that it never sealed to any but to *Abraham*, that was, *That he should be the Father of all them that believe.*

Thirdly, I deny, that Baptism was an Ordinance of the same Covenant; there were many that had an Interest in that Covenant, and a right to all the Ordinances thereof, that had no right to Baptism, *Luke* 3. 7, 8. and many that had no Interest in that Covenant, that yet had a right to Baptism; that Covenant was abrogated, *Zech.* 10. 11. before the Commission was given forth at large, *Mat.* 28.

You Query here, Whether Baptism be not some mark to distinguish the Members of the Church from those that are without?

Reply. First, If it be, then Persons are without till such time as they be Baptized, and so you Baptize them that are without. You needed not to have laboured so hard, to prove that Children are Church-members, seeing those that are without may yet be Baptized; to be without and within too, are Terms inconsistent; if they are without, they are not within; if they are within, then they are not without. No created Being can be in two places at one and the same time; a Person can't be a Member of the Visible Church, and yet at the same time be no Member thereof.

Secondly, I do not know that Baptism is of that use to distinguish the Members of the Visible Church: Persons

sons are and may be Members of the visible Church, tho' they are not baptized. You grant, that some must be discipled to Christ by instruction, antecedent unto Baptism, and to say, that they are discipled to Christ, and yet without, seems very absurd.

Secondly, You Query, Whether Baptism doth not seal remission of sins to such as are qualified for it, *Acts* 2. 38. 22. 16.

Reply. That God doth bless this Ordinance to Believers, and make it of use to confirm their Faith in the remission of sin, by the blood of Jesus Christ, I grant, yet this proves it not to be the seal of the Covenant of Grace; nor may a Person be known or concluded interested in the Covenant of Grace meerly from taking up this Ordinance; nor do I yet know any external Seal of that Covenant, by which a Person may be known to have an interest therein.

SECT. XIII.

YOU say, I took that in evil part which you spake concerning the rules of Disputation, when you intended no more than this, I should have defended, not proved.

Reply. I took it no otherwise than you do now explain it, and do again declare, that I do not pretend to much Skill in those rules, I may again err in them.

Thirdly, You say, if the Scripture in some places require Faith and Repentance before Baptism, and in other places asserteth, that the Children of Believers are Church-members, fœderally holy, and consequently fit Subjects for Baptism, then it must needs follow, that the Adult only are bound to profess their Faith before they are baptized, but the Children of Believers ought to be baptized first, and afterwards to believe and obey the Gospel.

Reply.

Reply. I grant all this, with a *Proviſo* that the Scripture does thus teach, but I deny that any one of thoſe things concerning Children is held forth in the Word.

Fourthly, You ſay that you told me, that Children are as capable of entering into Covenant with God as the little ones were in *Moſes*'s time; to which I replyed, that I did not diſpute their capacity, but the Authority thereof; ſhew me as clear a Command for it as *Moſes* did, and I will yield the cauſe. *Firſt*, You ſay, that there is ſuch ground laid for it in Scripture, that it is equivalent with a Command.

Reply. But then there was an expreſs command, *Deut.*29.1. So that there was no Scruple left in the caſe, and ſuch a one you can't produce.

Secondly, You Query, Whether *Adam* did not ſtipulate for his Poſterity, and by his miſcarriage brought Miſery upon them; and if we bring evil upon our Poſterity by our vices, it is but equal that they ſhould reap benefit by our Piety and Charity.

Reply. Firſt, It is yet to prove that *Adam* did ſtipulate for his Poſterity, though God made a Covenant with him, for a Covenant does not always imply a mutual ſtipulation; there was no ſuch ſtipulation in the Covenant that God made with all fleſh, *Gen.* 9.

Secondly, We do not ſtand the Repreſentatives of our Children, as *Adam* did of his, by vertue of that Covenant, ſo that this inſtance is not to the Purpoſe.

Thirdly, Though God made a Covenant with *Adam* for himſelf and his Poſterity, yet we can't make a Covenant with God for our ſelves and Poſterity.

SECT. XIV.

YOU ſay, the Objections that I urge againſt Infant-Baptiſm are two, the *Firſt* is grounded on the Commiſſion, *Mat.*28.19. from whence, in reply to your Anſwer,

Anſwer, I draw theſe two Concluſions: *Firſt*, That there is no other way of Diſcipling unto Chriſt but by Actual Teaching. *Secondly*, That Chriſt hath not commanded any more to be baptized than ſuch as are diſcipled by Actual Teaching. To this you ſay, *Firſt*, That the ſubſtance of the Commiſſion is to baptize Diſciples.

Reply. I grant it, the Commiſſion is, *Go, Diſciple to me all Nations, baptizing them*; and this muſt be taken excluſively of all but Diſciples; there are none but Diſciples put into the Commiſſion, therefore none but ſuch are to be baptized by vertue of this Commiſſion.

Secondly, You ſay, the Children of Believers are in the ſtate of Diſciples, they are Diſciples of Gods making without Man's Teaching.

Reply. This will never paſs without ſome proof to it; your bare ſay ſo is not of ſufficient Authority. *Secondly*, Children that are uncapable of learning Chriſt, can never ſtand in the ſtate of Scholars; who but a Child would account a Child a Scholar, that hath learned nothing?

Thirdly, You ſay, that if Children be Diſciples, then they may be baptized without preceding Teaching, for it's the ſtate of Diſciples that's enquired after, not the manner how they be diſcipled.

Reply. Firſt, I deny that there is any ſuch thing as a Diſciple of Chriſt that is not made ſo by the Word, either by reading or hearing, produce an inſtance if you can. A Diſciple of Chriſt is one that hath learned Chriſt, and to ſuppoſe a Perſon to be a Diſciple of Chriſt that never heard of Chriſt, is to ſuppoſe that which can't be ſuppoſed.

Secondly, I deny that the Commiſſion enjoyns the baptizing of any but ſuch as are taught by the Word antecedent thereunto: The Word *Them* in the Commiſſion is relative to all Nations taught or diſcipled, and there is

no teaching Christ but by the Word; what is not here expresly commanded in respect of the subjects of Baptism, is implicitly and consequentially forbidden.

Fourthly, You say, the Teaching in *Mat.* 28. 19. doth not exclude Infants from Baptism, but only shews that Aliens must be taught before they are baptized.

Reply. First, I find no such distinction in the Text as here you make, nor do I find any thing offered by you to prove your distinction.

Secondly, I find none in the Commission to be baptized but such as are taught antecedent thereunto; there is not one more put into the Commission.

Fifthly, You say, that Children are not to be excluded from Baptism because they are not capable of believing, though Faith be required to go before Baptism, *Mark* 16. 16. for Faith is there as much required to precede Salvation as to precede Baptism.

Reply. First, I would Query, Whether it be not the same Commission, this in *Mark* with that in *Mat.* 28. only varying in Terms, not in Things. *Secondly*, Whether a Believer in *Mark* be not the same thing with a Disciple in *Matthew*. *Thirdly*, How it comes to pass that a Child should be uncapable of believing, as he is by your own grant, and yet not uncapable of Discipleship, which is the same thing? I wonder you have not found out some shift for this before now. Could you not have said, that the Children of Believers are in the state of Believers, as well as to say, they are in the state of Disciples, and that they are reputed so? Surely the one would have past as well as the other; but here is an ingenious acknowledgment that they are uncapable of Believing.

Secondly, Here is a Grant, that Faith is required to go before Baptism, and what can be desired more? If it be required, Christ requires it, and how then can you adventure to baptize those that you confess are uncapable

ble of believing? is not this the Commission you act by? and is it not inserted in your Commission, that Faith must precede? have you any other Commission than this? and will this bear you out in the baptizing of such as are uncapable of believing? if this Commission requires Faith to go before Baptism, then have you no Commission that requires Baptism to go before Faith.

Thirdly, Children in an Infant-state are not the Subjects of this Commission, nor have Ministers any charge concerning them, though they are commanded to preach the Gospel to every creature, this word must be taken with some restrictions. *First*, It must be understood of rational Creatures, not of Brutes. *Secondly*, Of such among them that have the use of their Reason: Infants are rational Creatures, but they have not the use of their reason and understanding, they are not capable of receiving benefit by the Word, granted by your self *pag.* 63. it's irrational to think, that Ministers are bound by this Commission to preach to such that are in an Infant-state, and if not to teach them, then not to baptize them, for they are not bound to baptize more than they are bound to teach; and in that Faith is required to precede Salvation as well as to precede Baptism, this shews that they are the Adult only, and not Infants that Ministers have the charge of, by vertue of this Commission.

Sixthly, You say, that Children are capable of Salvation before they believe, and consequently they are fit to be baptized before they believe.

Reply. First, Though Children are capable of Salvation, yet they may not be capable of an Ordinance of Christ: Infants are capable of Salvation, yet they are not capable of the Supper of the Lord; now there is the same Faith required in order to Baptism as is required to the partaking of the Supper.

Secondly, A capability of Salvation is not the ground of Baptism; the Children of Unbelievers are as capable of

of Salvation as the Children of Believers. Christ speaks of Children indefinitely, *Of such such is the Kingdom of Heaven*; it would be very uncharitable to say, that none of the Children of Unbelievers are capable of Salvation.

You say, that there are three Arguments that you brought to prove, that the Children of Believers are Disciples. *First*, You argue it from *Mark* 9. 37. *Luke* 9. 48. Christ would have them to be received in his Name, and accounts the receiving of them the receiving of him, therefore they are Disciples. Against this you say I make two Exceptions:

First, That it is doubtful, whether this was the Child of a Believer or no: You say, it's very probable that this Child was born of such Parents that were of the *Jewish* Church; and seeing he expreſt so much favour to him, there is no reason to contemn him as one out of the Church.

Reply. As it was doubtful before, so it is still, you have left it but where you found it: You say, it's probable he was born of such Parents, but it is but probable, it's not certain; but grant this, and yet the doubt remains, the Child might be born of *Jewish* Parents that were Church-members, and yet not be the Child of a Believer, for such there were among the *Jews*, *John* 10. *Ye believe not, because ye are not my sheep*; so that my first Exception stands good. You say, it's the Child of a Believer, but you can't prove it, and it's your unhappiness you have espoused a cause that notwithstanding all the Attempts you make, go which way you will, you have but consequences to prove it by.

You say my Second Exception is this, that by a little Child here is meant a grown Person, one that hath humbled himself, and is become as a little Child, as appears by comparing both these places with *Mat.* 18. 5, 6. to this you say it's granted, that by little ones, *Mat.* 18.

18. are meant such, but this doth not argue that he speaks only of such, for it's evident he speaks also of Children uncapable of believing, because the *Greek* Word here speaks of an Infant, and it's clear that Christ speaks of the same Child here which he proposed as an Emblem to his Disciples, *Luke* 9. 48. *Whosoever receiveth this Child in my name, receiveth me.*

Reply. First, That the Child that was set before them was properly a little Child, is not denied; that which I deny is, that the Child that was to be received in Christ's Name is so to be considered. The little Child was but the Emblem of those that were to be received in Christ's Name; and whereas you say, that it's the same little Child that was to be received, you must know that one Scripture must be interpreted by another; it's the same thing that is handled by all three Evangelists, upon the same occasion, and to the same end, which was to teach his Disciples humility and meekness: And that in *Matthew* speaks not of the same Child, you grant, and yet it's the same thing that is there treated of; and *Pool*'s *Annotations* refers to *Matthew*, and tells us, that this of *Mark* and *Luke* must be interpreted by *Matthew*.

Secondly, *Mark* speaks not of the same little Child, but one of such Children in my Name; and though the Child was proposed as the Emblem, yet it's applyed to the Disciples both in *Mark* and *Luke* too; in *Mark* it's said, *That whosoever shall give you a cup of cold water to drink in my Name, because ye belong to Christ*, &c. *And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me*, &c. this can't be understood properly of a little Child, *Luke* 9. 48. *Whosoever is least among you, the same shall be great*: It's the safest way to expound Scripture by Scripture, and to take our measure from the clearest, where several speak of the same thing, as here they do; and by comparing the three Evangelists it appears plain enough, that the Child that is to be received in Christ's Name, is one that is become as a little Child.

Secondly

Secondly, You say, it's a little Child that is uncapable of believing.

Reply. He that is uncapable of believing is uncapable of Discipleship, for a Believer and a Disciple is the same thing; he that is a Disciple, *Mat.* 28. is a Believer, *Mark* 16. you well know that a Disciple of Christ is a Scholar of Christ, and that an infant is uncapable of.

Secondly, You say you proved, that Children were Disciples, from *Acts* 15. 10. *Why tempt ye God to lay a yoke upon the neck of the Disciples*, &c. To this you say I replyed, that the Persons that these false Apostles would have laid the yoak upon, were not the Children, but the Brethren; and the yoak was not barely Circumcision, but the false Doctrine together with it. To this you say, that Circumcision after the manner of *Moses* must need intend Children as well as the Parents, because they as well as their Parents were the Subjects of Circumcision, and so they as well as their Parents must need be Disciples.

Reply. This is a poor Answer with little of Argument, they must needs be so, because they were once the Subjects of Circumcision, but, Sir, does the Text lead you to this conclusion? or is there any thing in the Text that looks like it? the manner of *Moses* respects the Act, not the Subject; the Subject was described before they taught the Brethren, that they must be circumcised, but how must the Brethren be circumcised; why, after the manner of *Moses*. I gave you several Arguments in my last, to prove that Children could not be numbered among the Brethren here, but not one word of Reply have you made to them; and I dare say, that you are satisfied that Children can't be here numbred among them, and that's the reason you slipt them without a Reply.

Secondly, You say, that if the false Doctrine, toge-

ther

ther with circumcision be the Yoke that was laid on the neck of the Disciples, it must needs be granted that the Yoke was on the Children, with respect to the Act; and the Yoke being laid on Children as well as Men, it must needs be granted that Children are included among the Disciples.

Reply. To grant the false Doctrine, together with Circumcision, to be the yoke, and yet to say, that this must be laid on the Neck of the Children, is to argue for an impossibility, and it's contradictious to your own Principles: *p.* 63. You say, that Children are uncapable of receiving the Word; now if they are uncapable of receiving the Truth, then they are as uncapable of receiving a Lye. *Secondly*, It's to argue for an Impossibility, tho' Circumcision might have been imposed on them in an Infant-state, yet the false Doctrine, together with the Circumcision, could not; and to this purpose I argued the last time, why had you not removed the Objections? was it not because you could not? I offered you two things more, which you have not replyed to: The *First* was this, that to expound this Text of Children, is to expound it contrary to the signification of the word *Disciple*, as you well know; and if I had abused you in it, sure you would have returned me some Answer, I can't think you would have spared me. *Calvin* brings the same Text for instance, when he saith, that a Disciple and a Believer are used as several Words expressing the same thing.

Secondly, To expound this of Children, is to expound it contrary to that plain Text, *Luke* 14. 26. *Except a man hate Father and Mother, yea, and his own life also, he can't be my Disciple*, verse 27. *And whosoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my Disciple:* If the Children of Believers, considered as such, are the Disciples of Christ, what need then is there of any farther mark to describe a Disciple by? but a Disciple of

Christ is not so easily known, there must be some special Mark or Character which the Children of Believers may be destitute of, and of which a Child in his Infancy is uncapable, *John* 13. *By this shall all men know that ye are my Disciples, if ye have love one to another.*

Your third Argument, you say, that you brought to prove that the Children of Believers are Disciples, was, because they are holy in such a sence, that they have a right by vertue of the Covenant of Grace to be admitted Members of the Visible Church, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* My Reply to this, you say, is, that the holiness of the Child is not Fœderal Holiness, but of the same nature with the holiness of the Parent, and that the Parents were sanctified each to other, when both were Unbelievers.

To this you say, *First*, That though Marriage be of the Law of Nature, and the Children of Infidels may be lawfully born, yet they are not holy in the Apostles sence.

Reply. First, I take it for granted, that you allow my Exposition thus far, that the Sanctification of the Parents each to the other was by the ordinance of God, when both were Unbelievers. Not to deny in a point of Controversie, is silently to grant.

Secondly, Grant this, and it will naturally follow, that the Children were holy when both the Parents were Unbelievers, for the Holiness of the Children is derived from the sanctification of the Parents each to other.

Secondly, You say, though the Children may be lawfully born, yet they are not holy in the Apostles sence; for he speaks here of some Priviledge that the Children of Believers have above Pagans, and he expresly affirms, that the Children of Believers are holy, and the Children of *Pagans* unclean.

Reply. First, I deny that the Apostle speaks of any Privi-

Priviledge that the Children of Believers have above others, or that Believers and *Pagans* are here brought in competition. The buſineſs of the Apoſtle was to anſwer a caſe of Conſcience, whether the Believer might lawfully abide with his or her unbelieving Yoke-fellow? which caſe he anſwers in the affirmative, and proves the Lawfulneſs of their continuance from the Lawfulneſs of their ſtate; they were Husband and Wife, and ſo ſanctified each to other by the ordinance of God, and it's from their ſanctification each to other that he infers the Holineſs of the Children.

Secondly, I deny that the Apoſtle here doth expreſly affirm that the Children of Belivers are holy: He ſpeaks not of the Children of Believers, conſidered as ſuch, but of the Children of thoſe that were ſanctified each to the other, which Sanctification was antecedent unto Faith.

Thirdly, I deny that he doth expreſly affirm that the Children of *Pagans* are unclean; the Words are, *Elſe were your Children unclean*; had they not been ſanctified each to other, the ſame Children that now are holy had been unclean.

Thirdly, You ſay, that the Holineſs of the Child is not of the ſame nature with the Holineſs of the Parent, for the Unbeliever is not holy in himſelf, but is ſanctified in or to the Believer; but the Children are ſaid to be holy in themſelves, and not barely ſanctified to another.

Reply. Firſt, The Holineſs of the Child is not an Inherent Holineſs, nor is there any ſuch thing to be found in the Children of Believers more than in the Children of Unbelievers; *That which is born of the Fleſh is Fleſh.*

Secondly, The Holineſs of the Child doth not ariſe from the faith of the Believing Parent, but from the ſanctification of the Unbeliever; now ſuch as the root is, ſuch are branches, the holineſs of the Child being deri-

ved from the ſanctification of the Unbelieving Parent, it muſt neceſſarily be of the ſame nature. Is not the ſtream of the ſame nature with the fountain from whence it flows?

Thirdly, I deny, that the Unbeliever is ſanctified to the Believer; there is not a word of a Believer in the Text, it's to the Wife; it is not ſaid to the believing Wife, or the believing Husband, nor are they ſo to be conſidered in their ſanctification each to the other, but barely as Husband and Wife.

Fourthly, You ſay I tell you, that if it were granted, that the Holineſs here were fœderal, yet this would not render them Diſciples of Chriſt, becauſe many of the *Jews* that were fœderally holy were not Diſciples of Chriſt. This inſtance you ſay is impertinent, for the *Jews* were not fœderally holy in relation to Chriſt, till they embraced the Chriſtian Faith.

Reply. The Queſtion is not, Whether they were fœderally holy in relation to Chriſt? but, whether they were fœderally holy till Chriſt was offered up? if you deny this, it will ſoon be proved, the Partition-wall was not broken down till Chriſt was offered up, and till then they remain'd a ſeparate People; and whilſt they were a ſeparate People, they were a holy People: The Covenant in which they all ſtood held good till they weighed for his price thirty pieces of Silver, *Zach.* 11. 10, 11, 12. and whilſt they remained in Covenant, they were fœderally holy. You ſay your ſelf, *page* 17. *Book* 2. That the *Jews* were Church-members, were intereſted in the Covenant under the old Diſpenſation; and if ſo, they were fœderally holy all that time: And you grant, that the change of the Diſpenſation was when Chriſt was offered up, therefore they were a holy People until then; and if ſo, the inſtances that I have already given, *John* 4. 1. and 9. 27, 28. are ſufficient to prove that Perſons might be fœderally holy, and yet not Diſciples of Chriſt.

Fifthly,

Fifthly, You say, if I would have spoken to the purpose, I should have proved that the Members of the visible Church of Christ were not Disciples.

Reply. First, I would Query, Whether the *Jews* were not the visible Church of Christ? you say, *page* 65. They were the true Church of God: Were they the Church of God, and not the Church of Christ? you own them to be Christians, *page* 64. you make the Child of a *Jew* that was a Church-member, and the Child of a Christian, to be the same thing: Were they a Church of Christians, and yet not a Church of Christ? Either the *Jews* were the Church of Christ, or they were not; if they were, all your Objections are removed; if they were not, then tell me what Priviledge the Children of Believers have now lost, that once they had a right to, in their not being received Members of the Church of Christ? for if the Church of the *Jews* were not the Church of Christ, no Instance can be given that ever Children were admitted Members of the Church of Christ. I do not lay much stress on this, only I was willing you should see what might be built on a foundation of your own laying.

Secondly, If by the Visible Church of Christ you mean, a Church that is constituted to the New-Dispensation, (I hope you will bear with me if I keep a consistency in my own Writings) my work is to prove that each individual Member of such a Church is a Disciple of Christ, and not the contrary; but the Church of the *Jews* had many Members that were not discipled unto Christ, and yet they were all fœderally holy, so that fœderal Holiness and Discipleship are two things, the latter of which can't be argued from the former.

SECT. XV.

THE Second Objection that I brought against Infant-Baptism, you say, is this, there is no Example

in Scripture of any Infant that was baptized: In answer to which, you say, you gave me reasons why there was no Example delivered in Scripture: The *First* was, Because the Apostles were principally employed in teaching and baptizing Men: The *Second* was, Because that then there was no doubt made but Children were Church-members.

To this you say I reply, that the reason why the Apostles delivered nothing about the baptizing of Children, was, because it was no part of their work, there being no Precept for it, they had nothing to do with it.

Secondly, You say, the want of a Precedent is but a Negative Argument, and that's not valid in matter of Fact; and that I grant my self, that the Baptism of Children can't be denied for want of a Precedent, provided that there were any Precept for it; so that the matter is brought to this Issue, if there be any Precept for the baptizing of Children, then it may lawfully be done.

Reply. I am content to join issue with you, and to come to a fair Tryal, and to hazard the Cause upon the producing but one Precept; one such Evidence shall end the difference, and the Cause shall be yours at last.

You come now to bring forth your Evidences; you say that there is an implicite command for it, because it may be drawn by just consequence, drawn from clear grounds in Scripture, that Baptism doth of right belong to them; for if they be within the Covenant, and Members of the Church, and fœderally holy, as hath been proved, then it must needs follow by necessary consequence that they have a right to Baptism; and a necessary consequence drawn from Scripture hath the force of a command.

Reply. First, I perceive the Controversie is not like to be issued yet, if this be all the evidence you have to produce; and I think it's all: You would leave out none of your Witnesses, being just come to the Trial; all the Testimony

ſtimony that you have here brought in will not amount to one command, either explicite or implicite, and ſo not iſſue the Controverſie, unleſs you give up the cauſe.

Firſt, You ſay, that there is an implicite command for it, and that implies that there is no explicite command; if there had, this had been the time to have brought it forth. Now the Commiſſion is laid by, that will not be ſuborned for an evidence, Faith being required by that to precede Baptiſm, granted by your ſelf, *page* 72.

Secondly, Here muſt be conſequence upon conſequence, to prove your implicite command, enough to weary a Man to keep all in mind till he come to the concluſion: For, *Firſt*, You can't prove one of theſe Heads but by conſequence, either that the Children of Believers are within the Covenant, or fœderally holy, (which is the ſame thing, though you make two Heads of it, that you may have a threefold-cord) nor that they are Church-members, but by conſequence; for that is the way you have taken for each of them, and have laboured hard to little purpoſe. *Secondly*, When you have, as you think, proved one or all of theſe by conſequence, you muſt to the ſame task again for each of theſe, to prove them the ground of Baptiſm.

Thirdly, I ſhall bring in two Evidences that will invalidate all the Teſtimony that you have here brought in, and that is the Evidence of the *Phariſees* and *Sadducees*, that had all theſe Qualifications that you have mentioned; they were fœderally holy, within the Covenant, they were Church-members, they were all the Children of *Abraham*, theſe came to *John* to be baptized, and were denied, *Mat.* 3. 7, 8, 9, 10. *Luke* 3. 7, 8, 9. That theſe were all put by is evident; for, *Firſt*, *John* calls them *a Generation of Vipers*; who can think that he would ſet ſuch a Brand or Black Mark upon them, and yet baptize them? Would Baptiſm have waſh'd it

of again. *Secondly*, He over-rules their Plea, *Begin not to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father*; Why, was not *Abraham* a Believer, and were not they the Children of a Believer? Yes, but this will not now pass for a ground of Baptism; if they will be baptized, they must bring forth fruits meet for Repentance, Birth-Priviledge will not serve the turn. *Thirdly*, It appears, they were denied, *Luke* 7. 30. *But the Pharisees and the Lawyers rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him*, (that is, of *John*:) What Counsel could this be, but that which God gave them by *John*, to bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance. *John* would not baptize them upon the ground they offered themselves, which was, that they had *Abraham* to their Father; they would not be baptized upon the ground that *John* proposed, and so they go without it; can any think that *John* would have denied these who were Church-members, who were fœderally Holy, if these qualifications had brought them under a Precept to be baptized? Having gone as far as we can in this Trial, I would now Query, on whom the Duty of Baptism is incumbent? (I mean Infant-baptism, which you are pleading for,) Whether on the Minister, on the Child, or on the believing Parent?

First, I can't think it's the Childs Duty, or that the Child shall be called to an account for the neglect of it, who is utterly uncapable of knowing what Duty is, or of the performance thereof.

Secondly, It is not incumbent on the Minister. For, *First*, He has no Power to Baptize the Child, if the Parent deny it. *Secondly*, He has no Commission to Baptize more than are Discipled to Christ by the Word: And as for the believing Parent, either he is commanded to Baptize his Children, or he is not. If he be, produce it; if he be not, then is there no such thing as Infant Baptism of Divine Institution. Now this would

would be the ſhorteſt way, were we come to a Trial once more, to ſhew me where the believing Parent is commanded to Baptize his Child; and truly I think you do nothing that will iſſue the Point, till you do this.

In the next place, you ſay you urged three Reaſons for Infant-Baptiſm. The *Firſt* was, Becauſe the Primitive Church approved it, and held that it was derived from the Apoſtles themſelves. To this you ſay I Reply, that the Cuſtom of Baptizing Infants was not in uſe the firſt two hundred Years after Chriſt; and that if we receive one Tradition, we may receive more, and ſo deny the Scripture to be a perfect Rule. To this you ſay, that the Teſtimony of *Origen* and *Auſtin* are ſufficient to Confute my groundleſs Aſſertion.

Reply. I did not poſitively aſſert this; I told you I had heard ſo; I do not pretend to much acquaintance with Hiſtory.

Secondly, You do not know your ſelf in what Age it began; you ſay, *Book* 2. *Page* 28. that the Baptizing of Infants was ſo early in the Church, that it can't certainly be known when it began; ſo that it ſeems by this, it was not from the beginning; and if ſo, then not of Divine Inſtitution; No, though you could prove it to be of uſe the very next Age after the Apoſtles were deceaſed.

Thirdly, The Teſtimony of *Origen* and *Auſtin* is ſo mean a thing, that it is not worth a Reply; *Origen* reports, *That the Church hath received a Tradition from the Apoſtles, to give Baptiſm to Infants*; but by what hand hath ſhe received it? that no Body can tell; and who can think that the Apoſtles would ſend this by Word of Mouth, for one to deliver it to another, and ſo to hand it along by Mortal Men, that might die before they had done their Errand, and not Record it in the Word, where it would ſurely have been preſerved, over which the wing of Providence has been always ſpread; did

they

they not write often enough to the Churches, to have opportunity to acquaint them of a Truth of so great concernment as this is? Did they not put Pen to Paper often enough to Record the Baptism of Men and Women too, and never mind to Register the baptizing of Children with their Parents? This is strange, if any such thing was done: Were they not to *teach them to observe all things whatsoever Christ had commanded them?* And not one Word about Baptizing of Children in all the Records of the Apostles, but this must be sent by Word of Mouth: Yet as good hap was, the Church received it, so he tells you; but what Church it was, whether the Church of *Laodicea*, or the Church of *Rome*, or which of all the Churches it was that received it, that's not declared: Nor is it any great matter which received it first, for there is no doubt but it's to be had at *Rome* now, where the rest of the unwritten Traditions are. *Austin*'s Testimony is to the same purpose, that the baptizing of Children is no otherwise to be lookt on than as an Apostolical Tradition; and if so, then I conclude, that *Austin* could see no Scripture Testimony for it. But I have written enough about Traditions, to let you know how little esteem I have for them; therefore if you write again, I desire you to leave them out; for I will assure you, I will waste no more Paper to answer them.

Secondly, You say, there is no such danger as I pretend in believing the Testimony of the Fathers, or the Traditions of the Church, concerning the ancient Practise of Baptizing Children; for Tradition herein consents with Scripture, and we retain Infant-Baptism, because there is Scripture-proof to it, and not barely upon Tradition.

Reply. First, If it had been recorded in Scripture, then the Apostles needed not to have sent it by Word of Mouth to the Church. *Secondly*, If it were recorded

in

in Scripture, why did *Auſtin* declare, that it ought no otherwiſe to be accounted than as an Apoſtolical Tradition? *Thirdly*, If you have Scripture-proof for it, ſend me that, and keep your Traditions for your ſelf. *Fourthly*, It ſeems you can't credit the Teſtimony of the Fathers, nor yet the Traditions of the Church, unleſs you have Teſtimony from the Word to the ſame thing; and if you have Teſtimony from the Word, you have no need of the Teſtimony of the Fathers, nor yet of the Tradition of the Church.

The ſecond Reaſon you brought for the probability of the baptizing of Children in the Apoſtles time was, becauſe there were whole Houſholds baptized, wherein it's probable there were ſome Children. To this you ſay I Reply, that two of theſe Houſholds were ſaid to believe; the third was the Houſhold of *Stephanus*, and they were ſuch as had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints. The fourth was *Lydia*, and no Body knows whether ſhe was Maid, Wife, or Widdow.

Secondly, You ſay, there is no mention that the whole Houſhold of *Stephanus* believed.

Reply. Firſt, There is no mention that *Stephanus* himſelf believed; what then? May we conclude, that he was Baptized while an Unbeliever? *Secondly*, It's ſaid, that the Houſhold of *Stephanus* was the firſt Fruits of *Achaia*, and that they had addicted themſelves to the Miniſtry of the Saints, which is tantamount to Believing. *Thirdly*, There is no mention of one Child in all thoſe Houſholds, therefore no probability that Children were baptized from thoſe inſtances.

Thirdly, You ſay, that though it be ſaid, that the Jailor believed with all his Houſe, yet by a common Synechdoche it may ſignifie no more than the grown Perſons in his Family.

Reply. Though it be ſaid, *That the Jailer and all his Houſe*

House were baptized, yet by the same common Synechdoche may be signified no more than the grown Persons in his Family; and if I thought there were any need of it, I could argue the same way for the other three Families; but there is no need to run a Synechdoche in the Case.

The third Reason you urge, for the probability of Infant-Baptism in the Apostles times, was this; if Infants had been denied Church-membership in the Apostles times, those *Jews* that were by them Converted unto Christ would have made a stir about it, as they did about lesser things. To this you say I made no Reply at all; you think I would not have past it over so, if I had been able to return any reasonable answer to it.

Reply. I made this Answer to it, that your doubtless proved no more than your probabilities did, and that was the Reason I said no more, nor do I see any great Reason to say more to it now: What have you proved by it? Or what have you offered to prove by it, that has not been answered already?

Secondly, What are those lesser things that they made a stir about? The fullest account that I can have of them, is in *Acts* 21. 21. *They were zealous of the Law, and were informed that Paul did teach the Jews to forsake Moses's Law, not to Circumcise their Children, nor to walk after their Customs.* *First*, Then I would enquire, Whether it does not lye fair before us to conclude, that they did make a stir about this very Matter, because their Children were denied Church-membership? Have you not declared, that they were entered in by Circumcision? And is not here a stir made about this initiating Ordinance, (as you call it)? so that they came near the Case, if not home to it; but if their Children had been baptized, it's probable they would not have contended about Circumcision; or if they had, that the Apostle would

would ſoon have pacified them, by letting them know, that they had Baptiſm in the room thereof.

Thirdly, If they did not contend about this, it's probable God might give them more light in this great and weighty Matter than he did in leſſer things, the want of light in which would have occaſioned ſo great a ſtir. If you ſay, that all the Anſwer I have now returned is but probable; I anſwer, your Argument was but to prove a probability, nor had it more than a probability in it, if ſo much, and a probable Anſwer may ſerve to a probable Argument.

Laſtly, You ſay, that there is more need of an expreſs Prohibition, to exclude Infants from the Church, than there is of an expreſs Command or Example to receive them; for before Chriſt's coming they always enjoyed it, and if this ancient Priviledge be repealed, where is the Precept or Preſident for it? To this you ſay I Reply, that the Legal Adminiſtration is done away, and in that there is a repeal of their Church-memberſhip: To this you ſay, though the Legal Adminiſtration be done away, yet the Covenant remains, and all that are Church members have right under the new Adminiſtration to be admitted into the Church.

Reply. Firſt, All that are Church-members are in already; this might well have been ſpared.

Secondly, The Covenant it ſelf, in which the natural Seed ſtood, is done away, *Heb.* 8. *ult. Zech.* 11. 10.

Thirdly, In the change of the Diſpenſation there is a change of the Conſtitution, from National to Congregational; and if you can produce but one Infant that was a Member in any one New-Teſtament-Church, I will give you the Cauſe at laſt.

Thirdly, You ſay I tell you, that there is no need of an expreſs Prohibition to hinder Children from Baptiſm,

tism, because it was never commanded; and that which is not commanded in Matters of Worship, is implicitely forbidden; and that it was unlawful for *Nadab* and *Abihu* to offer Incense with strange Fire, which God commanded them not. To this you say, that if God command one thing in his Worship, it's unlawful to omit that, and do another; and this was the Case of *Nadab* and *Abihu*, who offered strange Fire, when the Lord had prescribed what Fire they should use, even Fire from off the Altar, *Lev.* 9. 6, 23, 24.

Reply. First, I confess the evil is the greater, when Men have a command, and omit what God requires, and proceed in a way of their own; yet observe, that the stroke came upon them for offering Incense with Fire that God commanded them not.

Secondly, If it be unlawful to omit what God requires, and take a way of our own that he hath not required, then we had need be sure that Sprinkling is Baptizing, before we lay by Dipping, and make use of Sprinkling. Had Baptizing been any other way than by Dipping, there had been no need to have made choice of a place where there was much Water, nor yet for the Administrator to have gone down into the Water with the subject: I had not mentioned this, if I had not been so fairly led to it; though I should be glad to see the Ordinances of Christ purely administred in respect of Matter and Form too.

Thirdly, If that which is not forbidden in expres Terms may be brought into the Worship of God, how burdensom would the Worship of God soon be.

Sixthly, You say, that it's granted also, that the substance of Divine Worship is contained in the Word of God, or may be clearly proved thereby; and what is not commanded, either explicitely or implicitely, in Matters of Worship, is in Effect forbidden, and ought

ought not to be obſerved as a neceſſary part of Religion.

Reply. Firſt, I acknowledge that here is ingenuity in giving a grant thus far, only here are two Words that are dubious: *Firſt*, What you mean by the ſubſtance of Worſhip. *Secondly*, What you mean by a neceſſary part of Worſhip; but where things are dubious, Charity binds me to put the beſt Conſtruction, and in things of this Nature, Prudence forbids me to enquire too far.

Seventhly, The Baptiſm of Infants, you ſay, is implicitely commanded in Scripture; and if ſuch Baptiſm be juſtifiable, then there needs ſome expreſs Prohibition to warrant the denial of Baptiſm to them.

Reply. Your implicite command for Infant Baptiſm is no where to be found in the Word; and what you have offered to prove it, has been anſwered, as I have met with it, and muſt now be left to the Reader to judge of it. As to the ſecond part, I grant it, that if Infant-Baptiſm had been warranted by the Word, there had then been need of ſome Word to warrant us to deny them; but it was never warranted by the Word, and therefore there is no need of any Word to forbid it: You grant your ſelf, that what is not commanded by the Word in matters of Worſhip, either expreſly or implicitely, is in effect forbidden, and ought not to be made uſe of.

Eighthly, You ſay, that ſeeing the Priviledge of Church-memberſhip, which belonged to Infants under the Legal Adminiſtration, is not repealed under the Goſpel, it follows, that the Children of Believers have a right to be admitted Members of the Church.

Reply. You grant a repeal of the Legal Adminiſtration, *Page* 81. and if the Adminiſtration be repealed, the Priviledges that they enjoyed under that Adminiſtration are repealed: Take away the Charter, and the

Pri-

Priviledges are loſt: How could the whole of their Church-ſtate be diſſolved in the change of the Adminiſtration, as you grant, *Page* 17. *Book* 2. and the Priviledge of their Children remain? Can the whole be diſſolved, and not the Parts? And did the Parents become Members again, or any of them, by vertue of the old Adminiſtration, or of the New? The Law of which New Adminiſtration you have *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. and can their Children claim it by vertue of the old Adminiſtration, when their Parents could not? Certainly if Children have a right, it's by vertue of the New Adminiſtration, and by that you muſt prove it, or you do nothing. To conclude then, I deſire you to read over the new Deed, or the Law of the New-Adminiſtration, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. and if you can find but one Clauſe in it that does Priviledge the Children of Believers to Church-memberſhip and Baptiſm in an Infant-ſtate, only ſend me that, and I will give you the Cauſe at laſt.

And now if you pleaſe to write again, in the Vindication of what you have aſſerted, I hope I may find an opportunity, and room enough to return you a fair Anſwer; and in the mean time, *Fare you well.*,

---

A BRIEF

DESCRIPTION

OF THE

Covenant of Grace,

OR THE

New Covenant,

THE Covenant of Grace is a Mutual Compact between the Father and the Son, before the World was, (the Son considered in the Divine Nature only) in behalf of the Elect of God, wherein the Son undertook the performance of certain Conditions on his part: And the Father engaged himself by several promises on his part, some of which were peculiar to the Son, others made to the Son in behalf of the Elect, who were the Subjects thereof.

Having given this Description of the New-Covenant, I shall in the next place prove each part thereof by the Word.

First, It is a Mutual Compact between the Father and the Son, *Isa.* 49. from 3, to 10. We have in these verses a Transcript of the whole Compact or Agreement that was between them.

First, The Father propoſeth, *verſe* 3. *Thou art my*

Servant, O Israel, in thee I will be glorified. This Propoſal was made to the Son, who was to be the Lords Servant, when he had taken our nature upon him, *Iſa.* 42. 1. *Behold my ſervant whom I uphold, mine Elect, in whom my ſoul delighteth.*

Secondly, We have the Anſwer of the Son, *verſe* 4. *Then I ſaid, I have laboured in vain, and have ſpent my ſtrength for nought, and in vain; yet ſurely my work is with the Lord, and my judgment with my God.*

In which Anſwer there are two things to be conſidered: *Firſt*, The Subjects here propoſed were too ſmall a number for ſo great an Undertaking; *I have laboured in vain:* Not that his labour was ſucceſsleſs, in that ſenſe he did not labour in vain, nor ſhed one drop of his blood in vain, he did ſee of the travel of his Soul with ſatisfaction, and was aſſured that the pleaſure of the Lord ſhould proſper in his hands: But the Elect within the confines of *Iſrael* were too ſmall a number.

Secondly, So ſmall a number as it was, he undertakes it at the firſt Propoſal; this is plainly intimated in theſe words, *My work is with the Lord, and my judgment with my God.* Though the Purchaſe would not anſwer the price, he would leave that to the Father, whom he knew would make it up.

Thirdly, The Son having granted the Propoſal, the Father ſpeaks again to the Son, *verſe* 5, 6. *And now, ſaith the Lord that formed me from the womb, to be his Servant, to bring Jacob again to him, though Iſrael be not gathered, yet ſhall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God ſhall be my ſtrength: And he ſaid, it is a light thing that thou ſhouldſt be my ſervant, to raiſe up the Tribes of Jacob, and to reſtore the preſerved of Iſrael: I will alſo give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayeſt be for ſalvation unto the ends of the Earth.* In which Words there are three things obſervable:

Firſt, There is a Promiſe made to the Son, *That he ſhould*

should be glorious in the eyes of Lord, that God would be his strength. *Secondly*, A Grant given, that *Israel* were too small a number for so great an Undertaking: *And he said, it is a light thing that shouldst be my servant, to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel. Thirdly*, The Elect among the *Gentiles* added unto the *Jews: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou may'st be for salvation to the ends of the Earth.*

That the Son was a party Covenanting may further appear, *Zach.* 9. 11. *As for thee, by the blood of thy covenant have I sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein there was no water.* This is the Father speaking unto the Son, and he calls it his Covenant, as being made by him, *Psal.* 89. 28. *My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my Covenant shall stand fast with him.* It's the Fathers Covenant, and it's the Sons Covenant, as being transacted between the Father and the Son. That it is the Sons Covenant is yet more evident, in that he laid down his life to confirm it, *Heb.* 9. 15, 16, 17. *For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, that they that are called might receive the promise of eternal Inheritance: For where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the Testator, for a Testament is of force when men are dead, otherwise it is of no force at all, whilst the Testator liveth.* Had not Christ been the Testator as well as Mediator, there had been no need for him to dye, nor could the Testament have been confirmed by his death. If a thousand dye, if the Testator live, the Testament is of no force. Either the New-Testament is confirmed by the Death of Christ, or it is not; if it be, then was Christ the Testator; if it be not, then it's of no force at all, and what condition are we now in.

Secondly, The New-Covenant was transacted between the Father and the Son before the world was, *Titus* 1. 2.

In hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lye promised before the foundation of the World began. This promise was made to Christ, for there was none in being but the Son to whom a promise could be made; before the World had a being it was made to him for the Elect, or else the Apostle could not have bottomed his hopes upon it, 2 *Tim.* 1. 9. *Who hath saved us, and called us with a holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and Grace, which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the World was.* How could this Gift of his Grace have been bestowed on us in Christ, but in the transact of the New-Covenant? This Grace, or Love, or Good Will of God, it's a New-Covenant Blessing. God hath made over himself by Covenant, *Gen.* 7. 7. And in so doing he hath made over his Grace; he could not make over himself, but he must make over his Grace, it being essential in God; now this was done before the World began. It was promulgated as soon as *Adam* fell, *The seed of the Woman shall break the Serpents head*; therefore it was in being before he fell.

The Mediatorship of Christ commenc'd as soon as sin had a being, he was the Lamb slain from the foundation of the World, therefore the New-Covenant was in being from the foundation of the World.

Thirdly, The New-Covenant was transacted between the Father and the Son, the Son considered in the Divine Nature only. This appears, *First*, In that it was transacted before the World began, before the Humane Nature had a being: *God did not send forth his Son made of a woman, till the fulness of time*, Gal. 4. 4. *Secondly*, It appears, in that the taking of the Humane Nature was an effect of the compact, *Heb.* 2. 17. *Wherefore it behooved him in all things to be made like to his Brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining unto God.* Merciful, with respect to us, faithful with respect to the Father. Now faithfulness doth imply

ply some pre-engagement. When Christ took our Nature upon him, he renders this as the reason, *That in the Volume of the Book it was written of him to do the will of God*, Psal. 40. 7, 8. This was not the Book of the Scripture, it was not written there antecedent to the penning of this Psalm, therefore take it of the Book of the Covenant, (to speak it after the manner of men) that which is called the Lamb's Book of Life, which the Subjects of this Covenant had their Names written in, *Rev.* 17. 18.

Fourthly, This Covenant was transacted between the Father and the Son, in the behalf of the Elect only. Here I shall premise two things. *First*, That God hath an Elect People. *Secondly*, That this Elect People were given to Jesus Christ. And then prove that this Elect People that are given to Jesus Christ, are the only Subjects of the New-Covenant.

First, That God hath an Elect People, a certain number of particular Persons, both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, that he hath chosen in Christ Jesus to Salvation as the end, and to Sanctification as the means.

First, That God hath an Elect People, *Mat.* 24. 22. *For the Elects sake those days shall be shortned*; ver. 24. *For there shall arise false Christs, and false Prophets, insomuch that if it were possible, they shall deceive the very Elect:* But that is impossible, they are so secured by the Decree of God, the Merits of Christ, and the Promises of this Covenant, *ver.* 31. *And he shall send his Angels, with a great sound of a Trumpet, and shall gather his Elect, from the four winds, from one end of Heaven to the other.* Isa. 65. 22. *And mine Elect shall long enjoy the work of their Hands.*

Secondly, These Elect are a certain number of particular Persons, *Eph.* 1. 4. *Who hath chosen us in him before the Foundation of the World, that we should be Holy, and without blame before him in Love.* *Paul* and the *Ephe-*

sians in particular, to whom he wrote this Epistle, *Rom.* 9. 11. *For the Children being not yet born, neither having done either good or evil, that the purpose of God according to Election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth.* Ver. 12. *It was said unto her, Jacob have I loved, Esau have I hated.* Now these Elect are known to God, they are not known to us, 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. *Nevertheless the Foundation of God standeth sure, having this Seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his:* Each individual Person are known to him: The Lord knoweth them by Name: *Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated. Their Names are written in Heaven,* Luke 10. 20. *They are written in the Book of Life,* Rev. 20. 15.

Thirdly, These Elect consist both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*; of *Jews,* Rom. 11. 5. *There is at this day a Remnant, according to the Election of Grace:* Of *Gentiles,* 1 Thess. 1. 4. *Knowing, Brethren, Beloved, your Election of God.*

Fourthly, They are chosen to Salvation as the end, and to Sanctification as the means, both in one Decree, 2 *Thess.* 2. 13. *We are bound to give thanks for you, Brethren, Beloved of the Lord, because God hath from the beginning chosen you to Salvation, through Sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the Truth:* To Salvation as the end, and to Sanctification as the means, both in one Decree.

The second thing to be premised is this, That this Elect People are given to Jesus Christ, *John* 17. 6. *Thine they were, and thou gavest them unto me:* Thine by Election, and thou gavest them unto me by fœderal Relation.

Either they must be considered the Fathers in respect of Election, or in respect of Creation. In the second sense we cannot possibly take it; for, *First,* In respect of Creation the whole World is his, but these are not all given to the Son: Those that are given to the Son are distinguished from the World, *Verse* 9.

I

I pray for these, I pray not for the World, but for those whom thou hast given me, for they are thine. They are not only distinguished from the World, as they are given to the Son, but as they are the Fathers too: *They are thine*, and that in a peculiar sense.

Secondly, Christ declares, that all his Number is the Fathers, and the Fathers are his: *All mine are thine, and thine are mine:* They are the same individual Persons.

Thirdly, Christ gives Eternal Life to as many as are given him by the Father, *John* 17. 2. but Eternal Life is given to none but the Elect, *Rom.* 11. 7. *The Election hath obtained, and the rest were blinded.* Therefore they are the Elect only that are given to Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, I shall prove that they are the Elect only that are given to Jesus Christ, that are the only subjects of the New Covenant. *First*, It appears, that they only are blest with the Blessings of the New Covenant, *Eph.* 1. 3, 4. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual Blessings in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.* But who are they that are thus blessed? Are they not those that were chosen in him before the Foundation of the World?

Secondly, It was upon their account only, that Jesus Christ underwent all his Sufferings, *Isa.* 53. 5. *For the Transgressions of my People was he smitten. He laid down his Life for the Sheep*, John 20. 15. *He loved the Church, and gave himself for them*, Eph. 5. 25.

Thirdly, It was upon their account only he had his Name *Jesus* given him, *Mat.* 1. 21. *And thou shalt call his Name Jesus, for he shall save his People from their Sins.*

Fourthly, It's only they that are the Heirs of the Promise, *Gal.* 3. 29. *And if ye be Christs, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.*

Fifthly, They only are justified by his Blood, *Rom.* 8. 33. *Who shall lay any thing to the Charge of Gods Elect? it is God that justifieth; who is he that condemns? it's Christ that dyed.*

Sixthly, They only shall be glorified, *Rev.* 20. 15. *And whosoever was not written in the Lambs Book of Life, was cast into the Lake of Fire.*

Fifthly, In the Transact of this Covenant between the Father and the Son, the Son undertook the performance of certain Conditions; *He was to raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel; He was to be a light to the Gentiles, and for Salvation unto the ends of the Earth.*

First, He was engaged to take our Nature upon him, he must be a merciful and faithful High-Priest in things pertaining unto God: He had covenanted so to do, and he must make good his Covenant, *Heb.* 10. 5. *Sacrifice and Offering thou wouldest not, a Body hast thou prepared me:* Ver. 7. *Then I said, lo I come.* He hath respect to the Covenant here, as being engaged thereby to take a Body.

Secondly, He was engaged by Covenant to fulfil the Law in our Nature, *Mat.* 5. 17. *Think not that I am come to destroy the Law or the Prophets, I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.* He came not only to fulfil the Law, but to fulfil it upon the account of the subjects of this Covenant, *Rom.* 10. 4. *Christ is the end of the Law for Righteousness, to every one that believeth.* He hath yielded that very Obedience that the Law aimed at, He was in Covenant to do whatever the Will of God was, *Psalm* 40. 7, 8. *Then said I, lo I come, in the Volume of thy Book it is written of me to do thy Will, O God: Yea, thy Law is within my Heart.* Now this was one part of the Will of God, that he should fulfil the Law, by yielding active Obedience thereunto: God sent him into the World on purpose. He was not only sent to make an

end

end of Sin, but to bring in Everlasting Righteousness, *Dan.* 9. 24. *Seventy Weeks are determined to make an end of Sin, to finish the Transgression, and to make Reconciliation for Iniquity, and to bring in Everlasting Righteousness.*

Thirdly, He stood engaged to offer up himself a peace-making Sacrifice, for the satisfaction of Divine Justice, *Heb.* 10. 5. wherefore when he cometh into the World, he saith, *Sacrifice and Offerings thou wouldst not, but a Body hast thou prepared me. Then said I, lo I come, in the Volume of thy Book it is written of me to do thy Will O God.* This was the Will of God, that he should offer up this Body; it was so the Will of God, that there was no avoiding of it, he must drink that bitter Cup: Therefore when he prayed, *Father, if it be possible, let this Cup pass from me*; he resigned up his Will to the Will of the Father; *Nevertheless, not my Will, but thy Will be done.* Whatever was the Will of God that Christ should do, that Christ was in Covenant to do; and therefore he saith, that *in the Volume of the Book it was written of him to do the Will of the Father.*

Fourthly, He was engaged by Covenant to bring in all the subjects thereof; to accept of himself on Gospel Terms, that so they might enjoy the good and Benefit thereof, *John* 10. 16. *And other Sheep I have, that are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one Shepherd, and one Fold.* He doth not say, I may bring, or I will bring, but I must bring. And why must he bring them in? but because he was in Covenant so to do.

Fifthly, He was engaged not only to seek, and to save that which was lost; but also to keep them, when he had sought them out, that they should stray away no more, *John* 6. 38. *I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that sent me, and this is the Will of him that sent me, that of all that he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.*

Sixthly

Sixthly, Jesus Christ stood engaged to confirm the Covenant by his Death, *Heb.* 9. 15. *For this cause he is the Mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Covenant, they that were called might receive the Promise of Eternal Inheritance. For where a Testament is, there must also of necessity be the Death of the Testator.* Verse 17. *For a Testament is of force after Men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all, whil'st the Testator liveth.* The Promises made to the Fathers were not confirmed 'till Christ was offered up, *Heb.* 11. 13. *These all through Faith obtained a good report, not having received the Promise, God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.* This Provision was made in the New Covenant, where all our Mercies are wrapt up: These are the Conditions that the Son undertook the performance of. Now what he was engaged to do and suffer, he hath made good, *John* 17. 1. *I have finished the Work that thou gavest me to do.* John 19. 30. *He cried out, it is finished, and he bowed the Head, and gave up the Ghost.* So that the Covenant is compleated on Christ's part, with respect to what he was to do and suffer, both which are of Eternal Efficacy, and being compleated on the Sons part, all the Promises made by the Father are confirmed and fulfilled, *Acts* 13. 32, 33. *And we declare unto you glad-tidings, how that the Promise that was made to the Fathers, God hath fulfilled to us their Children, in that he hath raised Christ from the dead.* The Promises were confirmed by his Death, and his Resurrection was a signal Manifestation of the fulfilling or Confirmation thereof; so that the New Covenant is now of force, the Death of the Testator hath confirmed the Testament.

Sixthly, In this Compact between the Father and the Son, the Father engaged himself, by several Promi-

ses,

ſes, ſome of which were peculiar to the Son; others made to the Son in behalf of the Elect, who are the Subjects thereof, *Iſa.* 49. 5, 7, 8. The Promiſes that are peculiar to the Son are as followeth: *Firſt*, *That he ſhould be glorious in the Eyes of the Lord, that God would be his Strength*, ver. 5. *Secondly*, That God would ſtand by him, and help him, *ver.* 8. *In an acceptable time have I heard thee, and in the day of Salvation have I holpen thee.* Here are two things to be conſidered: *Firſt*, Jeſus Chriſt took hold of theſe Promiſes, and bottomed upon them, *Iſa.* 50. 7, 9. *My God will help me, therefore have I ſet my Face as a Flint, and I know that I ſhall not be confounded. Behold! the Lord God will help me, therefore I ſhall not be aſhamed. Secondly*, The Father made good theſe Promiſes to Chriſt when he was offered up, 2 *Cor.* 6. 2. *For he ſaid, in an acceptable Time have I heard thee, and in the day of Salvation have I holpen thee; behold now is the acceptable Time, behold now is the day of Salvation.* When God was in Chriſt reconciling the World to himſelf, not imputing unto them their Treſpaſſes, then were theſe Promiſes made good: Then was the acceptable Time, then was the day of Salvation, then did God hear him, *Heb.* 5. 7. *He was heard in the things he feared*; then was he holpen under all his Sufferings.

Secondly, The Father engaged himſelf by ſeveral Promiſes made to the Son in behalf of the Elect, *Iſa.* 49. 8, 9. *Thus ſaith the Lord, in an acceptable Time have I heard thee, and in the day of Salvation have I holpen thee; and I will give thee for a Covenant of the People, to eſtabliſh the Earth, and cauſe to inherit the deſolate places*, ver. 9. *That thou may'ſt ſay to the Priſoners, go forth, to them that ſit in darkneſs ſhew your ſelves: That he ſhould be a light to the Gentiles, and for Salvation to the ends of the Earth.* Tit. 1. 2. *In hope of Eternal Life, which God that cannot lye promiſed before the World began.* I ſuppoſe that Eternal

Life here, comprehends all the good of the New Covenant. As Death is a comprehensive of all Misery, so is Eternal Life a comprehensive of all Happiness. *This Promise was made to Christ before the World began:* And it was made to him in behalf of the subjects of this Covenant, or else *Paul* could not have grounded his hopes upon it. I doubt not but all the Promises that are now in the New Covenant, containing Temporal, Spiritual, and Eternal Blessings, were made in the first Transact of the Covenant. As Christ did then engage to perform all the Conditions, so the Father engaged to bestow all the Blessings that were contained in the Promises; he did give Christ for a Covenant to the People in the very first Transact; and are not all the Promises *Yea* and *Amen* in Christ Jesus? All the Promises were confirmed by Christ, as he was considered the Testator; therefore I conclude, that they were all made in the first transact of the Testament. There are Promises put into the Covenant with respect to the subjects thereof, and nothing but Promises: The New Govenant is a bundle of Promises, there is not one Precept, nor one Threat to be found there; (on the Sons part it contained Conditions, that were to be performed by him, and that upon account of the subjects thereof;) On the Fathers part it contained only Promises, the fulfilling of which depended on the performance of the Conditions by the Son. These are the two parts of the Covenant, and the whole thereof; there is not a third part to be produced. That this Covenant is made up all of Promises, with respect to the subjects thereof, will appear in a few particulars.

First, There are nothing but Promises to be found in that which God calls the New Covenant, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *But this shall be the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel, after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Laws in their inward parts, and write them in*

their

their Hearts: And I will be their God, and they shall be my People: And they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest of them, for I will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more. God himself calls this the New Covenant, *verse* 31. *Behold the day is come, that I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel:* And this is that New Covenant which is contained in the 33, & 34. *verses.* And sure I am, there are none but Promises here: If we look *Gen.* 17. 7. *Ezek.* 36. 25, 26, 27. *Heb.* 8. 10, 11. in which Scriptures the New Covenant is most largely described, you will see nothing but Promises.

Secondly, It appears, in that the New Covenant is stiled the Promise, or Promises.

First, The Promise, in the singular Number, *Acts* 13. 32, 33, 34. *And we declare unto you glad-tidings, how that the Promise that was made to the Fathers, God hath fulfilled to us their Children, in that he raised him from the Dead, now no more to return to Corruption: He said on this wise, I will give you the sure Mercies of David.* By the Promise in the 32*d. verse* is intended the Covenant, for he presently addeth, *I will give you the sure Mercies of David.* And these are the Mercies of the New Covenant, *Gal.* 3. 29. *And if ye be Christs, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.* Gal. 3. 17. *The Law that was four hundred and thirty Years after could not disanul, that it should make the Promise of none Effect.* That which is there called the Promise, is in the former part of the same verse called the Covenant that was afore confirmed of God in Christ.

Secondly, It is sometimes called Promises, in the Plural Number, *Rom.* 15. 8. *Now, I say, that Jesus Christ was a Minister of the Circumcision, for the Truth of God, to confirm the Promises made to the Fathers.* Gal. 3. 16. *To Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made.*

Thirdly,

Thirdly, It appears, in that the ſubjects of this Covenant are ſtiled the Heirs of the Promiſe, *Heb.* 6. 17. *Wherein God willing more abundantly to ſhew to the Heirs of the Promiſe the immutability of his Council, confirmed it by an Oath.* What did God confirm by an Oath? Was it not the New Covenant? *Gal.* 3. 17. And what was the New Covenant but the Promiſe?

Fourthly, It appears, in that it was a free Covenant, in reſpect of the ſubjects thereof; there was no Condition put into it, the performance whereof doth entitle to the Bleſſings therein contained. It's their Union with Chriſt entitles, and not any thing done by them, 1 *Cor.* 3. 22, 23. *Gal.* 3. 29. You can't find one Condition put into the Covenant, with reſpect to the ſubjects thereof, in all the places where it is moſt largely deſcribed: All the Conditions were to be, and are performed by Chriſt. Now if this be granted, that the New Covenant contains nothing but Conditions on Chriſt's part, and nothing but Promiſes on the Father's part, it will follow, that ſuch as have no intereſt in the Merits of Chriſt, that have no Intereſt in the Promiſes of the Father, have no Intereſt at all in the New Covenant. There is not an internal and an external part in the New Covenant, (as ſome would have) the Covenant containing nothing but Promiſes, with reſpect to the ſubjects thereof. What can we ſuppoſe the external part to be, that a Perſon may have an intereſt in, that hath no Intereſt in the Promiſes? Such as have an Intereſt in the Covenant, have certainly an Intereſt in the Promiſes; *To Abraham and his Seed were the Promiſes made.* And here take notice of a few things:

Firſt, There is not one Subject of the New Covenant that ſhall go without the Bleſſings thereof, Juſtification, Sanctification, and Glorification, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *This is the Covenant that I will make with the*

Houſe

House of Israel, after those days saith the Lord; I will write my Laws in their Hearts, I will be their God, and they shall be my People; they shall all know me from the least to the greatest of them: For I will forgive their Iniquities, and remember their Sins no more. There is not one subject that shall not know the Lord, not one that shall miss of the Pardon of Sin: And consequently not one that shall come short of Salvation; for such as are Justified, and Sanctified, shall certainly be Glorified.

Secondly, There can't be one subject brought into this Covenant by the Faith of the Parent, there are as many in already as ever will be: *Their Names were written in the Lambs Book of Life from the Foundation of the World*, Rev. 17. 5. And all the World wandered after the Beast, *Whose Names were not written in the Lambs Book of Life from the Foundation of the World.* We are not here to understand every individual Person of the World; but only such, *Whose Names were not written in the Lambs Book of Life from the Foundation of the World.* God had his two Witnesses at the same time, these did not admire the Beast, they bore their Testimony against him: And if so, then *their Names were written in the Lambs Book of Life*; and that long before they began to bear their Testimony against him, *even from the Foundation of the World.* We can no more add to the Subjects of this Covenant, than we can add to the Decree of Election.

Thirdly, It is not possible for a Person that was once a subject of this Covenant to lose his Interest therein, *Jer.* 32. 40. *I will make an Everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good: And I will put my fear in their Hearts, that they shall not depart from me.* God Covenants here for himself and them too: *First*, For himself, *That he will never turn away from them to do them good.* He hath engaged all his Attributes to be exerted as the Case required,

quires, his Wisdom to direct, his Power to protect, his Grace and Mercy to save. He Covenanteth for them too, *That he will put his fear into their Hearts, that they shall not depart from him.* This Covenant is free and absolute, and is now confirmed by the Death of the Testator; and therefore, there is no disanulling or adding thereunto: No Name to be struck out, nor yet put in, no Legacy to be altered or changed. This appears by the instance that the Apostle gives of a Man's Covenant, *Gal.* 3. 15. *Brethren, I speak after the manner of Men.* If it be but a Man's Covenant, when it is confirmed, no man disanulleth it, nor addeth thereunto; this he brings to shew from the very Nature of a Covenant, (or Testament) how unalterable the New Covenant (or Testament) is, being confirmed by the Death of the Testator. But here are some Objections that must be answered before I leave it.

Objection the *First*, That the Covenant that was made with the Lord Jesus Christ, was the Covenant of Redemption, not the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant.

In Answer to this I shall propose a few Queries:

First, I desire to know where this Distinction is to be found? for I cannot find it in the word of God; or by what mark the Covenant of Redemption, and the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant, may be known one from the other, if they are distinct Covenants? for I cannot find any Marks or Characters in the Word that are peculiar to each of these. I have met with many that have made the Distinction, but I could never meet with one as yet that could make it Intelligent to me, whatever they fancy to themselves: No, not *Gelapsy* himself, who I think was the first Founder of it. The Author to the *Hebrews* mentions but two Covenants, the first and the second, an Old and a New, one that is confirmed,

confirmed, and another that is done away; and yet he handles the Covenants more largely and distinctly then any other of the Pen-men of Scripture had done before; and doth plainly shew, that Christ was the Testator of the New Covenant, *Heb.* 9. 15, 16, 17. And if so, then was the New Covenant made with Christ as a party Covenanting.

Secondly, I would know, Whether the Covenant of Redemption may not properly be called the Covenant of Grace? Whether God did ever manifest more of his Grace and Mercy, either to *Jew* or *Gentile*, than in giving Jesus Christ, *To raise up the Tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel, to be a light to the Gentiles, and to be for Salvation to the end of the Earth?*

Thirdly, Whether the New Covenant be not the Covenant of Redemption, as well as it is the Covenant of Grace? My meaning is, Whether Redemption be not a Branch of the New Covenant? Whether Jesus Christ was not *the Mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the Transgressions that were under the first Covenant, that they that are called might receive the Promise of Eternal Inheritance.* I find Redemption, Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification, put into the New Covenant, and all confirmed by the offering up of the Lord Jesus Christ. So that I see no room for a Covenant of Redemption, distinct from the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant.

Objection the *Second*, The Covenant of Redemption was made with Christ, but the Covenant of Grace, or New Covenant, was made with us, *Heb.* 5. 8. *Behold the day is come, saith the Lord, that I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel, and the House of Judah*, &c. To this I Answer,

First, We are not here (by the Word *make*) to understand the first Transact of the New Covenant, for in that respect the New Covenant was made long be-

fore; it was promulgated as soon as *Adam* fell, therefore it was in being when he fell. If the Covenant of Grace was not from the beginning, I desire to know by vertue of what, *God did write his Law in the Hearts of his People*, from the beginning.

Secondly, By the Word *make*, we are to understand the Confirmation of the New Covenant, which was made long before. It is observed by those that understand the Greek, that the Word signifieth the Consummation thereof, and that it should be read thus, *I will consummate a New Covenant with the House of Israel*; and it's applied to the offering up of Christ, by whose Death the New Covenant was confirmed, *Heb.* 10. 14, 15, 16. *For by one Offering he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified.* This Perfection consists in the Remission of Sin, and this Remission is that the Spirit bears Witness unto; *Their Sins and Iniquities will I remember no more.* And from hence the Apostle draws this Inference, *Where Remission of these is, there is no more Sacrifice for Sin.*

Objection the *Third*, The Covenant of Redemption is absolute, but the Covenant of Grace is conditional: Faith is the Condition thereof, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that Believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved.* To this I Answer,

First, If Faith be the Condition of Interest in the Covenant of Grace, then Baptism is the Condition also; the Text saith, *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved:* God hath joined them together, and no Man may put asunder what God hath joined. Now should this be granted, that Baptism is the Condition of Interest in the Covenant, then the Argument for Infant-Baptism, which is this, that Children have an Interest in the Covenant, therefore they must be Baptized, is gone, there being no Interest in the Covenant antecedent thereunto. And should the Objection it self be granted, that

that Faith is the Condition of Interest in the Covenant, the Argument for Infant-Baptism will fall to the ground, unless you will say, that all the Children of Believers do believe as well as their Parents.

But this I think is a task too hard for any to undertake; sure I am, it is too hard for any to go through withall. Faith comes not by Generation, but by Regeneration, in respect of the Principle, and by hearing in respect of the Act.

Secondly, The Text doth not say, He that believeth, shall have an Interest in the Covenant, but that *he that believeth, shall be saved:* Salvation here intends Glorification, for it is put in opposition to Damnation. Now though it be granted, *That he that believeth shall be saved*; yet it doth not follow, that Faith must be considered as a Condition, the performance of which doth entitle us to Salvation. Salvation may be considered as an end following, Faith as a means preparing, fitting and disposing, but not as an end depending on Faith, as a means procuring, or as a Condition, the performance of which may be considered that which doth entitle us thereto.

Secondly, Faith is so far from being the Condition of the Covenant, that it is a Fruit of Interest therein, both in respect of the Principle and Act too.

First, In respect of the Principle, it's a New Covenant Blessing, held forth in a free Promise, *Ezek.* 36. 26. *A new Heart also will I give unto you, and a new Spirit will I put within you, and I will take away the Heart of Stone out of your Flesh, and will give you an Heart of Flesh.*

First, This Promise is not made to all, but to a peculiar People: This is evident, *First*, In that the Promise is absolute, it doth not hang on Conditions to be performed by us, what can be considered as a Condition antecedent unto a new Heart. *Secondly*, In that all do not enjoy the Benefit of it.

Secondly, Thoſe to whom this Promiſe is made have an Intereſt therein, antecedent to the change of the Heart.

Thirdly, This new Heart that is here promiſed, is a Heart renewed; it's not new in reſpect of Matter, but in reſpect of the Form; which new Form conſiſts in thoſe new Principles that are infuſed in a Work of Regeneration, ſo that the Principle of Faith is held forth in a free Promiſe.

Secondly, In reſpect of the Act: *Firſt*, As 'tis conſidered the Act of the Underſtanding, *Iſa.* 54. 13. *All thy Children ſhall be taught of God.* Jer. 31. 33. *They ſhall all know me, from the leaſt to the greateſt:* This is the Act of Faith, as it is conſidered the Act of the Underſtanding, which is always followed with the Act of the Will; *John* 6. 45. *Every one that hath heard and learned of the Father, cometh unto me.*

Secondly, As it's conſidered as the Act of the Will, ſo it's held forth in a free Promiſe, *Pſalm* 110. 3. *Thy People ſhall be willing in the day of thy Power:* John 6. 37. *All that the Father giveth me ſhall come unto me.* Now if Faith be a fruit of Intereſt in the Covenant, then it is not a Condition; but it is a fruit of Intereſt, it doth not preceed but follow Intereſt, and is an effect thereof.

Objection the *Fourth*, The Covenant of Redemption had no Mediator, but the Covenant of Grace, or the New Covenant had. To this I anſwer:

Firſt, If there were no Mediator in the Tranſact thereof, yet it's apparent that the Son engaged to be a Mediator in the Tranſact thereof. Had there been no Mediator, there could have been no Redeemer; Chriſt was no otherwiſe a Redeemer, then as he was a Mediator, *Heb.* 9. 15. *For this Cauſe he is the Mediator of the New Covenant, that by means of Death, for the Redemption of the Tranſgreſſions, that were under the firſt Covenant, they that were called might receive the Promiſe of Eternal Inheri-*

Inheritance: He must be a Mediator, that he might be a Redeemer. By vertue of the same Covenant that Christ is a Redeemer I find he is a Mediator, and that is the New Covenant: He is both Redeemer and Mediator, and also the Testator thereof. Having now done with the New Covenant, I shall make some Remarks on the Old.

Observing the various Apprehensions that are among Professors, concerning the Covenant that God made with *Abraham*, and the natural Seed, considered as such, *Gen.* 15. 18. which Covenant was signed with Circumcision, *Gen.* 17. 10. dedicated with the Blood of the Sacrifices, *Exod.* 24. 8. and renewed with all the Congregation of *Israel*, Deut. 29. 10, 11.

And likewise the Extreams that Men have run upon, according to their various apprehensions; some making it to be the Covenant of Works, or so many New Editions of that Covenant that God made with *Adam* in a state of Innocency, others erring as much on the other hand, making it to be the Covenant of Grace: I shall endeavour to free it from the absurdities that will necessarily follow these two Extreams. But, *First*, I shall prove that the Covenant *Gen.* 15. 18. is the same that is mentioned in the other three places quoted before. And that it is so, appears,

First, In that the Subjects are the same in each of these, the Natural Seed, considered as such. *Secondly*, In that the Inheritance is the same in each of them, the Land of *Canaan*: This is sufficient to prove it the same Covenant, in these four Texts of Scripture. Either the Covenant spoken of in all these places is the same, or it is not; if we say they are distinct Covenants, we shall be to seek for Names to distinguish them by, one from the other; if we say it's the same Covenant often repeated, then the Question will be, whether it be the Covenant of Works, the Co-

nant of Grace, or a distinct Covenant from each of these.

First, It's not the Covenant of Works, it differs from that in many respects.

First, It differs from the Covenant of Works in respect of the Persons covenanting: That was made with *Adam*, this with *Abraham*; tho' *Abraham* was a subject of that, yet *Adam* was not a subject of this.

Tho' he lived long after he brake the Covenant of Works, yet he was dead long before this Covenant was in being.

Secondly, *Adam* was a Representative in that Covenant; while he stood we stood, when he fell we fell; *Rom.* 5. 12. *Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the World, and Death by sin, and so Death passed upon all men, for that all had sinned*, or, *In whom all had sinned*, Margent. But this Covenant had no representative, each subject stood and fell by himself, *Exod.* 32. 33. *And the Lord said unto Moses, whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book.*

Thirdly, They differ in respect of the Subjects thereof: That Covenant took in all Mankind that descended from *Adam* by ordinary generation, *Rom.* 15. 18. *Therefore as by the Offence of one judgement came upon all men to condemnation*: If all Men had not had an interest in that Covenant, and stood really under the threat thereof, the Sentence would not have been clapt on all for the breach thereof, but this Covenant took in no more with respect to the inheritance thereof but the natural seed of *Abraham*; such as were born of *Sarah*, *Ishmael*, and the Proselited *Gentiles*, had nothing to do with the Land of *Canaan*. Now as the Seed of *Adam* were abundantly more than the Seed of *Abraham*, so the Subjects of that Covenant were abundantly more than the Subjects of this; they were many whole Nations that were in being when this Covenant was in being, that were never taken into

into this Covenant, as the Subjects thereof. This Covenant was never intended for comprehension, but for separation, *Exod.* 19. 5, 6. *Now therefore if you will obey my voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, you shall be a peculiar treasure unto me, above all people, for all the Earth is mine*; *and ye shall be to me a Kingdom of Priests, an holy Nation*; that is, a separate Nation. It was this Covenant that was the Partition-wall between *Jew* and *Gentile*, that was broken down when Christ was offered up.

Fourthly, They differed in respect of the Bond thereof, the Bond of that Covenant contained the Moral Law only. The ten Precepts that were first written in the heart of Man by Nature, afterwards in Tables of Stone, *Deut.* 4. 14. *He declared unto you his Covenant, which he had commanded you to perform, even ten Commands, and he wrote them upon Tables of stone.* The Lord spake these Words, and he added no more, *Deut.* 5. 2. but the Bond of this Covenant contained besides these a great many Political Laws, which respected *Israel*, as they were considered a Common-wealth, and reached no more but the stranger that was within their Gate, and Ecclesiastical Laws, with respect to their Church-state, which were all put down in the Book of the Covenant, *Exod.* 21. 22, 23. *Chapters.*

Fifthly, They differ in respect of the Tenor thereof; that Covenant was a Covenant of Life, the Tenor whereof was, *Do this and live.*; had *Adam* kept that Covenant, he had never returned to the Dust again, but this was not a Covenant of Life, *Gen.* 15. 15. *Thou shalt go to thy Fathers in peace, thou shalt be buried in a good old age:* This was spoken to *Abraham* the same day the Lord made a Covenant with him. And here observe, it was not spoken as a Threat, as the Lord spake to *Adam*, *In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt dye*; here was no Proviso in the case, but dye he must: Yet was it not a Threat but a Gracious Promise. Life was never put into

this Covenant, neither to be continued here, nor to be enjoyed hereafter.

Sixthly, The first sin broke that Covenant, *Rom.* 5. 16. *Not as it was by one that sinned, so is the free gift, for the judgment was by one to condemnation*, (that was by one act of sin) *but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.* But the first sin did not break this Covenant, *Abraham* was guilty of a foul Miscarriage as soon as this Covenant was made, in going in to *Hagar*, and many transgressions were committed by his Seed before they were possessed of the inheritance, yet this Covenant remained.

Seventhly, That Covenant admitted of no Repentance: Had *Adam* broke his Heart with Grief, he could never have been reinvested with the Priviledges of that Covenant: The threat was, *In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt dye*, Or, *In dying thou shall dye:* Which threat was immediately turned into a Sentence, as soon as ever *Adam* fell, *Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return:* Rom. 5. 18. *Therefore by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation*, &c. The Sentence was immediately past, and remains unrepealed to all not redeemed by Jesus Christ. I cannot see how that Covenant can be said to be renewed, when the Curse that was clapt on all for the first transgression, remains on all, but such for whom Jesus Christ hath born it; nor to what purpose it should be renewed, seeing Justification was never to be had by the Works of the Law since the first transgression, *The Law being become weak through the flesh:* So that it could not give Life, whatever Obedience might be supposed to be yielded thereunto. I say, the Covenant of Works admitted of no Repentance, but this Covenant did, *Levit.* 26. 41, 42. *If their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their Iniquity, then will I remember my Covenant with Jacob, and also my Covenant with Isaac, and also my Cove-*

Covenant with Abraham will I remember, and I will remember the Land. Now an uncircumcised heart may be humbled, tho' not sincerely, as *Ahab*'s was, 1 *Kings* 21. *ult. Seest thou how Ahab humbleth himself, this evil shall not come in his days:* There might be an outward Humiliation and Reformation, where the Heart was not upright, upon which Reformation God might remove the Judgment, *Psal.* 78. from 34, to 39. this Covenant is not then the Covenant of Works.

Secondly, This Covenant is not the Covenant of Grace; there are a great many Marks and Characters by which they may be distinguished one from the other.

First, They differ in respect of the Persons with whom they were transacted: The Covenant of Grace was transacted with the Lord Jesus Christ, *Isa.* 49. from 3, to 10. this I have cleared *p.* 1. therefore shall say no more to it now; but this Covenant was transacted with *Abraham*, *Gen.* 15. 18. *The same day the Lord made a Covenant with Abraham, saying, unto thy seed have I given this whole land.*

Secondly, The Covenant of Grace was transacted between the Father and the Son, before the World was, *Titus* 1. 2. *In hopes of eternal life, which God that cannot lye promised before the World began.* 2 Tim. 1. 9. *Who hath saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our Works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given to us in Christ Jesus before the World was.*

I do not amplifie on these Scriptures, having done it already, *p.* 2. But this Covenant was not in being till *Abraham* had a being; it bears Date but four hundred years before *Israel* came up out of *Egypt*, *Gen.* 15. from 13, to 19. This Covenant was never heard of before, no instance can be given of it till then.

Thirdly, They differed in respect of the Subjects thereof: The Subjects of the Covenant of Grace are the Elect only, *Abraham* and his Mystical Seed, *Gal.* 3. 16.

To

To Abraham and his seed were the promises made; he saith not to seeds, as of many, but to thy seed, as of one, and that is Christ: Christ, not personally considered, for then all the Promises would have terminated in the person of Christ, but mystically considered, Christ and the Elect, Head and Members, *Gal.* 3. 16. *And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the Promise.* This Scripture is sufficient to decide the Controversie about the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace; clear your relation to Jesus Christ, and you may conclude your relation to *Abraham*, and consequently your interest in the Covenant of Grace: It was *To Abraham and his seed that the promises were made*; not to every Believer and his seed. Nor did the Promise take in all the seed of *Abraham*, there were some that were properly his Seed according to the flesh, that yet were no part of his Mystical Seed, to whom the Promises were made, *Rom.* 4. 12. *And the father of the Circumcision, to them that are not of the Circumcision only, but that walk in the steps of that faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised.* It was not enough to demonstrate them to be the Mystical Seed of *Abraham*, that they were circumcised, though they were his Natural Seed, *Rom.* 9. 7, 8. *Neither because they are the seed of Abraham are they all Children, but in Isaac shall thy seed be called*; that is, *they that are the Children of the flesh, these are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed:* (Here *Ishmael* is put by.) It was not the Children of the flesh, considered as such, but the Children of the Promise that were accounted for the seed. Some you see were the Children of *Abraham*, that were not the Children of the Promise, and such as were not the Children of the Promise were never accounted nor intended as a part of that seed with whom the Covenant was established, *Gen.* 17. 7. nor were all the Posterity of *Isaac* accounted for the seed, *There was an Esau as well as a Jacob, the one hated, the other loved*;

nor

nor were all the Posterity of *Jacob* accounted for the seed, *For all were not Israel that were of Israel.* I say, the Subjects of the Covenant of Grace are the Elect only, and to this agree the Assembly in their larger Catechism, *p.* 81. their Words are as followeth, 'The Covenant of 'Grace was made with the Lord Jesus Christ as the Se-'cond *Adam*, and in him with all the Elect of God, as 'his Seed. But this Covenant took in all the Natural Seed, considered as such, both Elect and Non-elect, there were none put by, it was made with all the People, *Zach.* 11. 10. With all the Congregation of *Israel*, the Captains of their Tribes, their Officers, with all the Men of *Israel*, from the Hewer of the Wood to the Drawer of the Water, it took in the whole Camp, their little Ones, their Wifes, and the Stranger that was among them; the *Egyptians* that came up with them out of *Egypt* as well as the *Israelites*, for they came up a mixed multitude, *Exod.* 12. 13. when it was dedicated with the blood of the Sacrifices, *Exod.* 24. 8. *Moses sprinkled the Book and all the People, and said, behold the blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these words.*

Fourthly, The Covenant of Grace was absolute, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *This shall be the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel after those days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their hearts, and write it in their inward parts, I will be their God, and they shall be my people; and they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest, for I will forgive their iniquities, and remember their Sins no more:* And it denotes thus much, that pardon of sin doth precede Sanctification. Here is not one Condition in the Text, nor any thing that looks like a condition; but this Covenant is partly absolute, and partly conditional, that some of *Abraham's* Seed should possess the Land of *Canaan*, that was absolute, *Gen.* 15. 18. *The same day the Lord made a Covenant with Abraham, saying, unto thy seed have I given this*

this whole land, &c. but their continuance in it, and their Posterity in the enjoyment of it, did hang all on Conditions of their Obedience, *Deut.* 28. 1, 2. *If thou shalt diligently hearken unto the Lord thy God, to do all that he commandeth thee, then all these blessings shall come upon thee*, &c. ver. 15. *But if thou shalt not hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, to do all that he commands thee, then all these Curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee*, &c. Now according to all the words of the 28*th.* Chapter, was *Moses* to make a Covenant with them in the 29*th. Chapter*, ver. 1.

Fifthly, They differed in the matter of the Promises, so that they differed in the very Essence and Substance thereof, and not only in the Circumstances, (as some would have it.) The Promises are an essential part of a Covenant, the Promises of the Covenant of Grace are better Promises than the Promises of this Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 6. *But now hath he obtained a more excellent Ministry, by how much also he is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was established on better promises:* The Promises are better on a twofold respect; *First*, In that they are absolute, when the Promises of this Covenant are conditional, but this I have spoken to in the preceding head. *Secondly*, They are better, in that they contain in them better blessings, Justification, Sanctification and Glorification, *Jer.* 31. 33, 34. *Psal.* 84. 11. God hath put spiritual Blessings into the Promises of the New Covenant, but the Promises of this Covenant contain only outward blessings, temporal Enjoyments; if you look *Deut.* 28. from 1, to 15. where you have a List of the Blessings of this Covenant, you will find none but outward and temporal Enjoyments there.

That this Covenant contained outward and temporal blessings only, doth farther appear, *Rom.* 3. 1. *What advantage then hath the Jew, or what profit is there in Circumcision, much every way, but chiefly because to them were committed*

mitted the Oracles of God. Now I suppose that by circumcision here is to be understood the Covenant which was signed with circumcision, into which God put all those blessings that were peculiar to the *Jew*, distinct from the *Gentile*, the chief or top of which Blessings were the Oracles of God, and yet it was in it self but an outward and temporal benefit, there were many among them that reap't no advantage at all by it: The Word preached did not profit them, not being mixt with Faith in the hearts of them that heard it. Now if the highest Privildge that they enjoyed by vertue of this Covenant, was barely to have the Word of God vouchsafed to them, then this was not the Covenant of Grace, for there are greater Blessings to be found there: There is a Promise of *Writing the Law of God in the heart, that they shall all know the Lord*, Jer. 31. 33. *That God will put his Spirit within them, and cause them to walk in his statutes, to observe his judgments, and do them.* A Heart to understand and conform to the Word of God, is a greater blessing then barely to have the Word vouchsafed to them, and that is a New Covenant Blessing.

But here is one Objection that must be Answered; but some may say, That God did make over himself to *Israel* by vertue of this Covenant, *Gen.* 17. 8. *And I will be their God.*

To this I answer, It's true he did, but there is a vast difference between the Lords making himself over to a People by vertue of the Covenant of Grace, and his making himself over to *Israel* by vertue of this Covenant; when God makes himself over to a People by Covenant, it is to make good that Covenant, and to give out the Blessings contained therein, to be enjoyed by the Subjects thereof according to the tenor of the Covenant; such as the Covenant then is, such are the Priviledges of that People that have an interest in God by vertue thereof.

First,

First, The Covenant of Grace is absolute, and God hath made himself over to the Subjects thereof absolutely, *Jer.* 31. 33. *I will be their God, and they shall be my people:* Here is no *if* in the case, but this Covenant is conditional, and God did make himself over to *Israel* on conditional terms, *Jer.* 7. 23. *Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my People.*

Secondly, The Covenant of Grace contains Spiritual Blessings, Justification, Sanctification, and Glorification, so then by vertue of the Covenant of Grace he is their God to justifie, sanctifie, and glorifie them, but this Covenant contained outward and temporal blessings only, *Deut.* 28. from 1, to 15. they could expect no more than God had put into the Covenant.

Thirdly, By vertue of the Covenant of Grace he is their God for ever, *Jer.* 32. 40. *I will make an everlasting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good, and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me:* And if God will never turn away from them to do them good, and to do them all the good that they need from a God, they may then conclude with the *Psalmist*, *This God is our God, for ever and ever, he will be our Guide to death.* But that Interest that *Israel* had in God, by vertue of this Covenant, might be lost, *Hosea* 1. 9. *Call his name Loammi, for ye are not my people, neither will I be your God:* Ten Tribes cut off at once, and such of them as had no other interest in God but what they had by vertue of this Covenant, have now no interest in God at all, no Enjoyment of him, but are for ever shut out of his Presence; so that though God be an eternal Good, yet their relation to him by vertue of this Covenant was but temporal; therefore I said, that this Covenant contained temporal Blessings only.

Sixthly, They differed in respect of the Mediator: Jesus Christ is the Mediator of the Covenant of Grace,

Heb.

Heb. 9. 15. *For this cause he is the Mediator of the New-Covenant*, &c. *Heb.* 12. 24. *But Moses was the Mediator of this Covenant*, Exod. 32. 30. *And it came to pass on the morrow, that Moses said unto the people, ye have sinned a great sin, and now will I go up unto the Lord, peradventure I may make an attonement for you:* He was a middle Person between the Lord and them, but Jesus Christ was never the Mediator of this Covenant, no instance can be given where Jesus Christ is called the Mediator of this Covenant; *He is said to be the Mediator of a better Covenant*, Heb. 8. 6. but he is not said to be the Mediator of this: If he had been the Mediator of this Covenant, he had been the Redeemed also of the Subjects thereof, considered as such, but he was not their Redeemer, therefore he was not their Mediator; those for whom he is a Mediator, for them also he is a Redeemer, *Heb.* 9. 15.

Seventhly, They differed in the Dedication therof; the Covenant of Grace was dedicated or confirmed by the Lord Jesus Christ, and that with his own blood.

First, It was Christ confirmed it, he was the Testator, and he confirmed the Testament by his Death, *Heb.* 9. 15, 16. the Promises made to the Fathers were fulfilled by him, *Acts* 13. 33.

Secondly, He confirmed it by his own blood; it was by a bloody Death: His blood is called *The blood of the Covenant*, Zach. 9. 11. Even as *Moses* called the blood of the Sacrifices, *Exod.* 24. 8. with which this Covenant was confirmed, *The blood of the Covenant*; so is the blood of Christ called *The blood of the Covenant.* That he confirmed the New Covenant with his own blood, appears,

In that we have a Symbol of it to this day by his own Ordination, in the Supper of the Lord: Christ tells us, that the Cup in the Supper is his blood of the New Testament, *Mat.* 26. 28. that is, it's a Symbol of Christ's blood, with which the New Testament was confirmed,

and

and we ſhould look on it ſo when we come to the Supper of the Lord; but *Moſes* dedicated this Covenant not with his own, but with the blood of Oxen, *Exod.* 24. 8. *And Moſes took the blood that was in the baſons, and ſprinkled the Book and all the People, and ſaid, behold the blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you, concerning all theſe words.* Jeſus Chriſt never confirmed this Covenant by his blood, no inſtance can be given thereof.

He was ſo far from confirming this Covenant, that he made it void when he confirmed the Covenant of Grace, *Zach.* 11. 10.

Eighthly, The Covenant of Grace is an undivided Covenant, he that hath an intereſt in a part hath an intereſt in the whole; the branches of that Covenant are ſo concatinated and knit together, that he that can clear his intereſt in a part, may conclude his intereſt in the whole: It is intereſt in Chriſt that gives us a right to any part thereof; he that can't clear his intereſt in Chriſt, can't challenge an intereſt in one New-Covenant Promiſe; and he that can clear his intereſt in Chriſt, may conclude his intereſt in the whole, *Gal.* 3. 29. *And if ye be Chriſt's, then are ye Abraham's ſeed, and Heirs according to the promiſe.* But this Covenant was a parted Covenant, a Perſon might have an intereſt in a part that had not an intereſt in the whole; *Iſhmael* and the *Proſelited Gentiles* had a right to Church-membership, and to the Ordinances of this Covenant, that had no right to the Land of *Canaan*, that was the inheritance thereof.

Ninthly, Once an intereſt in the Covenant of Grace, and for ever an intereſt therein, *Jer.* 32. 40. *I will make an everlaſting Covenant with them, that I will never turn away from them to do them good, and I will put my fear in their hearts, that they ſhall not depart from me:* We do not hold falling from Grace, and yet we can't deny it, if intereſt in the Covenant of Grace may poſſibly be loſt; but intereſt in this Covenant might be loſt, *Hoſea* 1. 9. *Ye are*

not

not my People, neither will I be your God; and yet they were once his people. By vertue of this Covenant the Lord gives a Bill of Divorce to ten Tribes at once.

Tenthly, The Covenant of Grace contains Bleſſings only, there is no Curſe put into it, there is no Plague that ſhall come near the dwellings of thoſe that are the ſubjects of the New-Covenant; the Summ and Subſtance thereof is bleſſedneſs, *Gen.* 22. 18. *In thy ſeed ſhall all the Nations of the Earth be bleſſed.*

Secondly, There are nothing but Promiſes put into the Covenant of Grace, and therefore there can be nothing but Bleſſings contained in it. Curſes are held forth in Threats, not in Promiſes, but there are no Threats put into this Covenant, therefore there can be no curſe there.

Thirdly, The Subjects thereof are all bleſſed, *Gal.* 3. 8. *They that are of faith*, (that is, of Chriſt, Faith being taken objectively,) *are bleſſed with faithful Abraham.* That there are nothing but Bleſſings in the Covenant of Grace, appears, in that thoſe very things that are in themſelves the matter of the Curſe, (as Death, and other Afflictions) being in the Covenant of Grace, are turned into Bleſſings unto the Subjects thereof, 1 *Cor.* 3. 21, 22. *Rom.* 8. 28. But this Covenant contains Curſes as well as Bleſſings, *Deut.* 28. from 15, to the end; and 29. 20, 21. *The Lord threatens that he will ſeparate them out of all the Tribes of Iſrael, according to all the Curſes of the Covenant.* The Curſes then that were written in the book of the Law were the Curſes of this Covenant.

Secondly, Theſe Curſes might fall on the Subjects of this Covenant, without a ſanctified uſe of them, as they did on thoſe that were compared to the evil figs, *Jer.* 24. 8, 9, 10. *The Lord threatens that he would give Zedekiah, and his Princes, and the reſidue of the men of Judah, to be removed to all the Kingdoms of the World, for their hurt, to be a Reproach, a Taunt, and a Curſe:* Yet theſe were the Subjects of this Covenant. But thoſe that were compared to the good

Figs, such as had an interest in the Covenant of Grace were sent away into the same Captivity for their good, *verse* 5.

Eleventhly, The Covenant of Grace can't be broken, it's confirmed by the Lord Jesus, and now there is no disannulling of it; the Subjects thereof have all their sins pardoned by that one Oblation, *Heb.* 10. 14. *By one Oblation he hath for ever perfected them that are sanctified:* By perfection here we are to understand remission, and this Word *For ever* shews, that it is all sin, past, present, and to come, this is witnessed by the Holy Ghost, *ver.* 15, 16. *Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more:* Pardoned Sins will never break this Covenant, and the Subjects thereof have no other but what are pardoned: God hath covenanted, *That he will not turn away from them to do them good, that they shall not depart from him:* How then can they break Covenant with God? but this Covenant might be broken, and was broken by the Subjects thereof.

First, It might be broken, *Gen.* 17. 14. *That Man-Child that is not circumcised the eighth day, shall be cut off from his People, he hath broken my Covenant.*

Secondly, It was broken, *Jer.* 31. 32. *The which my Covenant they brake, altho' I was an Husband unto them:* This very Covenant that God made with *Israel*, *Deut.* 29. 10. when he brought them up out of *Egypt*, they brake, as appears by comparing *ver.* 25. with *Jer.* 31, 32.

Twelfthly, The Covenant of Grace was the Second Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 7. *If that first Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the Second*; but this Covenant was the first, *Heb.* 9. 18. *So neither the first Covenant was dedicated without blood, for when Moses had spoken every Precept, he sprinkled the Book and all the People, and said, this is the blood of the Testament which the Lord hath enjoined you:* This carries us back to *Exod.* 24. 8. and

and shews plainly, that the Covenant that was there dedicated with the blood of Sacrifices was the first Covenant, and that it was distinct from the Covenant of Grace. It was the first Covenant, not in respect of the Transact thereof, in that sence the Covenant of Grace was the first that ever was; but it was first, in that it was first confirmed by Blood.

Thirteenthly, The Covenant of Grace was faultless, there was no deficiency in it, it was *A Covenant ordered in all things, and sure*, 2 Sam. 23. 5. That Covenant made Provision for satisfying the Justice of God, and for magnifying his Mercy, there was enough in it to relieve all the necessities of the People of God, but this Covenant was not faultless, *Heb.* 8. 7. *If the first Covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second*; but we see there was place sought for the second, and found too, and therefore the first was not faultless.

It was not positively faulty, it was a good Covenant, considered in it self, and did answer the ends of God for which it was made; but it was negatively faulty, there was not that in it which did answer all the ends of God, he had higher ends than could be answered by this Covenant, which were the Exaltation of his own Glory in the Salvation of his People. This Covenant could not answer these: Pardon, Peace, Reconciliation, Sanctification, and Glorification, were never put into this Covenant; if they had, all the Subjects thereof should have enjoyed the benefit of it. God is a faithful God, a Covenant-keeping God.

Fourteenthly, The Covenant of Grace is a New Covenant, *Heb.* 9. 15. *He is a Mediator of the New Covenant*, &c. but this is an old Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 13. *In that he saith a New Covenant, he hath made the first old.*

Fifteenthly, The Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 6. *He is a Mediator of a better Covenant*,

eſtabliſhed on better promiſes. I have ſhewn already in what Reſpects the Promiſes are better, in that they are abſolute, and contain ſpiritual bleſſings: Now if the Promiſes are better, the Covenant muſt needs be better, for the Promiſes are an eſſential part of the Covenant.

Secondly, As the Covenant of Grace is a better Covenant, in reſpect of the Promiſes, ſo it's a better Covenant in reſpect of the conditions, for they are all performed by Chriſt, (but this was a worſe Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 7. *This firſt Covenant was not faultleſs*, there can't be a better, but there muſt be a worſe ; there cannot be a degree of compariſon where there is but one :) The conditions of this Covenant were to be performed by the Subjects thereof.

Sixteenthly, The Covenant of Grace ſtill remaineth, *Heb.* 12. 24. *We are come to Jeſus the Mediator of the New Covenant:* He remains a Mediator, therefore the New Covenant ſtill remains ; he is not a Mediator of any other but the New Covenant, but this Covenant is done away, *Heb.* 8. 13. *In that he ſaith a New Covenant, he hath made the firſt old ; now that which is old decayeth, and is ready to vaniſh away:* The *Geneva* reads it, that which is old is abrogated, and ſo it was by the death of Chriſt, if you look on the Contents, placed before this Chapter, you will ſee the Author was of the ſame mind, that this Covenant was diſtinct from the Covenant of Grace, and that it was made void by the Oblation of Chriſt; it runs thus, That by the Eternal Prieſthood of Chriſt, the Levetical Prieſthood of *Aron* is aboliſhed, and the Temporal Covenant with the Fathers, by the Eternal Covenant of the Goſpel. When Chriſt was offered up, then was this Covenant made void, *Zach.* 11. 10. *Then I took my ſtaff, even Beauty, and cut it aſunder, that I might break my Covenant that I had made with all the People, and it was broken in that day:* That was, when they weighed for his price thirty pieces of ſilver.

silver. Dr. *Owen* observes on the place, that when the Covenant of Grace was confirmed by the offering up of Christ, that then the peculiar Covenant that God made with *Israel* was made void, and *Israel* ceased to be a Church. If this Covenant that was made with all the People, and that was broken when Christ was offered up, was not that Covenant that was made with *Abraham*, and all the Natural Seed, *Gen.* 15.18. that was signed with circumcision, *Gen.* 17. 10. that was dedicated with the blood of the Sacrifices, when *Moses* sprinkled the Book and all the People, *Exod.* 24. 8. and that was renewed with all the Congregation of *Israel*, *Deut.* 29. 10, 11. then shew me what Covenant it was; shew me another Covenant if you can, that was made with all the People of *Israel*, and that was made void when Christ was offered up. But here are some Objections that must be removed out of the way:

Object. 1. The Covenant that Christ brake, *Zach.* 11. 10. was the Covenant of Grace, for it was that Covenant that Christ himself had made, and he did not make a Covenant of Works with all the People. To this I answer,

First, I grant that Jesus Christ made this Covenant with them, as he was considered in the Divine Nature, and so one with the Father: I deny that he made it with them, as he is considered as Mediator. Christ is not always to be considered as Mediator in what he is said to do, but sometimes as Creator, in respect of the Divine Nature, *Col.* 1. 16. *For by him were all things created*, &c. By him, not considered God-man as Mediator, but as one with the Father, in respect of the Divine Nature, and in this sence he may be said to make this Covenant with the People, *Exod.* 23. 20, 21. *Behold I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place that I have prepared, beware of him, obey his voice*, (His Voice is no otherwise obeyed, but in their

Obe-

Obedience to the commands of God, nor is it heard but in the commands of this Covenant, which are the commands of God) *Provoke him not, he will not pardon your iniquities, my Name is in him,* my Nature is in him, he is God : Now if he will not pardon their iniquities, he is no Mediator for them, for those for whom he is a Mediator, for them he is a Redeemer, *In which redemption there is remission of sins,* Heb. 9. 15. Eph. 1. 7.

Secondly, If this Covenant which Christ brake when he was offered up was the Covenant of Grace, that was a bad fruit of his Oblation, for that Covenant that was then broke was never renewed again, so that there is now no Covenant of Grace, this would render our estate very deplorable.

Thirdly, The fallacy of this Objection appears, in that the Covenant of Grace was then confirmed when this Covenant was made void, the Death of the Testator confirmed the Testament, and therefore it was not the Covenant of Grace that was then broken.

Object. 2. Tho' the Covenant of Grace was then confirmed in respect of the substance thereof, yet it was broken in respect of the Administration or Dispensation thereof; and in that respect the Covenant might be said to be broken. To this I answer,

First, That the Dispensation of the Covenant was then changed I grant, the Old Administration done away, and a New Administration appointed, a New Commission given out as soon as Christ was risen, *Mat.* 28. 19. according to which all Ordinances are to be administred in respect of matter and form. *Secondly,* The Dispensation of the Covenant is now extended larger than before, the Commission is, to *Teach all Nations, to preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

Thirdly, The Covenant could not be said to be broken in this sence, with respect to the *Jews,* tho' the Dispensation was changed, for it was extended to them as well as the *Gentiles,* and to them primarily, *Luke* 24. 47. *That Repentance and Remission of sins should be preached unto all Nations, beginning at Jerusalem.* Hence then I conclude, that the Covenant that is here said to be broken, is not the Covenant of Grace, neither in respect of the Essence, nor in respect of the Administration, but a distinct Covenant.

Object.

Object. But if the Covenant that was made with all the People of *Israel* was made void when Christ was offered up, then the Moral Law or Ten Commands was made void, for that was a branch of that Covenant, and comprehended in those Laws that *Israel* was bound to observe, *Deut.* 28. 2.

To this I answer, it doth not follow that we are discharged from the Moral Law, as its considered a rule of Life, tho' it be most certain that this Covenant be made void, the Moral Law was in being as a Rule of Life, tho' not written in Tables of Stone before this Covenant was in being.

Secondly, The Moral Law reached farther than this Covenant, when this Covenant had a Being; my Meaning is, it was a Rule of Life to the *Gentiles*, that were not the Subjects of this Covenant.

Thirdly, He that made void this Covenant hath confirmed the Moral Law, that same Law that was given out upon Mount *Sinai*, signifying that it is perpetual binding, as a Rule of Life to all, *Mat.* 5. 17, 18, 19. *Till Heaven and Earth pass, one jot or tittle shall not pass from the Law, till all be fulfilled.*

Now by all the Marks and Characters that I have laid down, by which I have distinguished the Covenants one from another, it doth appear that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, and the Natural Seed, considered as such, was a peculiar Covenant, distinct from the Covenant of Works made with *Adam*, and all Mankind; and also from the Covenant of Grace made with the Lord Jesus Christ, and in him with all the Elect of God. But some may say, if this be neither the Covenant of Works, nor the Covenant of Grace, what Covenant is it? By what Name may we call it? I answer, you may call it the Covenant made with all the People, that's a Name the Scripture gives it, *Zach.* 11. 10. and if you consult the four forementioned places, you will find that it was made with all the people of *Israel*, but the Covenant of Grace was never made with all the People, that took in the Elect only, the Mistical Seed of *Abraham*, or you may call it the Covenant of Circumcision, so *Stephen* calls it, *Acts* 7. 8. or you may call it the first Covenant, that's a Name it's known by, *Heb.* 9. 18. a Name by which it is distinguished from the New Covenant; or if you will, you may call it the Typical Covenant, that's a Name according to its Nature. *First*, The Subjects thereof were Typical, *Exod.* 4. 22, 23. *Israel is my son, my first born, let my sons go, that they may serve me.* *Secondly*, The Inheritance was Typical, the Land of *Canaan*, and that Rest that *Joshua* gave them therein, *Heb.* 4. 8. Their Rest in *Canaan* pointed out that Eternal Rest that came in by Christ, *ver.* 9.

Thirdly, The Mediator was typical, *Moses* was the Mediator of this Covenant, *Exod.* 32. 30. He typed out the Mediatorship of Christ, *Heb.* 8. 6.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, The Dedication was typical, the blood of the Sacrifice, *Exod.* 24. 8. that typ't out the blood of Christ, by which the New Covenant was confirmed, which is also called the blood of the Covenant, *Zach.* 9. 11.

Fifthly, Their Priesthood, and also their going into the Holy of Holies, with the blood of Calves, and of Goats, was typical, that typ't out the Priesthood of Christ, and his going into the Holy Place not made with hands, and that with his own blood, *Heb.* 9. 12.

Sixthly, All the Ordinances of this Covenant were typical, *Heb.* 9. from 1, to 11. they were all figures for the time then present. That this Covenant was typical, appears, in that it vanished, as all the Types did, when the substance was come, *Heb.* 8. 13. *Zach.* 11. 10.

There is but one thing more that I would note, by which it appears that this Covenant was distinct from the New Covenant, and that is, the Apostle calls them Covenants, in the Plural Number, *Eph.* 2. 12. *At that time ye were strangers to the Covenants of Promise*; I think he would not have spoken in the Plural Number if there had been but one Covenant.

Object. But some may say, by Covenants is intended Dispensations of the same Covenant, for tho' there be but one Covenant, yet there hath been two Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace. To this I answer,

First, We had better read it as God by his Servant wrote it, who knew how to phrase it better than we: To read it Covenants is better sence than we can make by reading it Dispensations.

Secondly, Tho' there have been two Dispensations of the Covenant of Grace, yet there were not two Dispensations at the same time. The time that this Text relates to was antecedent to the offering up of Christ, and then there was but one Dispensation; the New Dispensation of the Covenant of Grace was not till after Christ was risen again.

That it refers to a time antecedent to the offering up of Christ, will appear, if we consider *ver.* 11, 12, 13. In *v.* 11. he tells them, *That in times past ye were Gentiles, in the flesh*; that was before the offering up of Christ. In *v.* 12. *At that time they were strangers to the Covenants of Promise.* In *v.* 13. He tells them, *That they who sometime were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ*: If they were made nigh by the blood of Christ, then the time in which they were far off (which was the time in which they were strangers to the Covenants of Promise) was antecedent thereunto. So that it's in vain to turn the Word Covenant into Dispensations, unless you can clear it, that there were two Dispensations of the Covenant of Grace at the same time, both antecedent to the offering up of the Lord Jesus.

FINIS.